BṚHADĀRAṆYKOPANIṢAD-BHĀṢYA-VĀRTIKA

BUBV 1.3

Udgītha Brāhmaṇa

शास्त्रोक्तज्ञानयुक्तानां कर्मणां ज्ञानतस्तथा ।।
सर्वत्र वेदशास्त्रेऽस्मिन्मृत्युभावः फलं श्रुतम् ।। १ ।।

[In these verses Sureśvara, following Śaṅkara's Bhāṣya, points to the connection between the preceding portion of the BU and this Brāhmaṇa.]

Everywhere in this Vedic lore is heard (that) the result of the (various ritual) activities, joint with the instruction imparted by the scriptures as also (that which results) from knowledge[1], is becoming (one with) Mṛtyu[2]. [1]

This verse aims at pointing out the distinction between the Udgītha Upāsanā and every other Upāsanā, as understood in this Brāhmaṇa. Though *mṛtyubhāva* is said to be the result of any of the other Upāsanās, it is not absolute liberation. This is the first point of distinction between the Udgītha Upāsanā and other Upāsanās. NKL says: The Brahman is called the Udgītha, because it refers to meditation on, or pondering over, the nature of Prāṇa (=Brahman) and not to any ritual.

[1]This refers to *jñāna* about the true nature of the ritual activity which leads to non-eternal reward; this knowledge leads to *mukti*. But, there seems to be here only concessional acceptance of *jñānakarmasamuccaya*. The Udgītha Upāsanā is distinct from every other Upāsanā, for it is not *śāstrokta-karman* but it is a means to the acquisition of *jñāna* mentioned just before. The word *jñāna* mentioned in the first line refers to the instruction of the Śruti (*vijñāna*).

[2]Refer to BUBV 1.2. See Introduction to *Sureśvara's Vārtika*

on Aśva- and Aśvamedha Brāhmaṇa (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1990), pp. xv-xvii; and the next verse.

आध्यात्मिकपरिच्छेदव्यावृत्तिर्यत्समाश्रयात् ।।
स मृत्युर्मृत्युशब्देन फलभूतोऽत्र भण्यते ।। २ ।।

That Mṛtyu, by resorting to which there results cessation of bodily limitations, is mentioned here[1] by the word *mṛtyu*[2] which has been the result[3]. [2]

[1]In the word *ādhyātmika*, *ātman* means 'body', cf. 1.1.4; 144; 213; 223.

[2]This is a reference to BUBV 1.2 (cf. Introduction to *Sureśvara's Vārtika on Aśva- and Aśvamedha Brāhmaṇa*, pp. xvii-xviii) and also *mṛtyvātmabhāva* in BUB.

[3]Namely, the result of ritual activity performed after knowing its true nature as worship of Prāṇa, the inner self.

या त्वश्वमेधगत्युक्तिः सोपलक्षणसिद्धये ।।
कर्मज्ञानान्तराणां स्यान्नाश्वमेधगृहीतये ।। ३ ।।

As to the statement of the result of the Aśvámedha, it is for effecting the indication of the various knowledges of (different) activities (i.e. worships); it is not for (understanding the result of) the Aśvamedha (only). [3]

NKL states that the Upāsanās other than the Aśvamedha Upāsanā (viz. Agni Upāsanā) do not bring about the same result, viz. *mṛtyuprāpti*; that is to say: they do not effect *brahmaprāpti*.

अल्पीयःफलसंप्राप्तिरल्पीचोज्ञानकर्मतः ।।
अल्पत्वमभिभूतेः स्यात्तयोरासुरपाप्मभिः ।। ४ ।।

Accruing of a lesser[1] reward (results) from lesser activities and knowledge. Smallness comes from the overpowering (of those two[2]) by (their contact with) the demoniac sins[3]. [4]

[1]The first 'lesser' refers to such an Upāsanā as implies subject-object relationship and the latter 'lesser' refers to anything else

than the worship of the knowledge of (the nature of) the Brahman.

[2]Namely, activity and knowledge.

[3]Such as *rāga*, *lobha* etc. These are defects of individuals; in other words, there is no purification (i.e. purging of the sins) of *an* individual's *citta*.

कुतस्तस्याभिभूतस्य रागाद्यासुरपाप्मभिः ।।
उद्भूतिः कर्मणोऽत्यर्थं ज्ञानस्य च निगद्यताम् ।। ५ ।।

[An objection is being introduced:]

Be it told as to whence there originate the activity and the knowledge which are overpowered by the demoniac sins such as attachment etc. above *(ati)*[1] the desired end. [5]

[1]That is, setting aside. This refers to *pitṛlokaprāpti*; cf. CU 5.10.4; BU 3.1.8; *Jaiminīya Upaniṣad* 2.8.11.

मृत्युं साक्षादवाप्नोति ज्ञानयुक्तेन कर्मणा ।।
इत्येतद्बहुशोऽश्रावि पूर्वग्रन्थेषु चागमैः ।। ६ ।।

That one obtains Mṛtyu[1] itself by means of activity joint with knowledge was declared on several occasions[2] by earlier Śruti texts[3]. [6]

[1]This Mṛtyu is Prāṇadevatā connected with various Upāsanās; viz. the status of Hiraṇyagarbha.

[2]This refers to *mṛtyur asyātmā* (cf. BUBV 1.2.225) etc., and other sentences connected with other (prescribed) Upāsanās.

[3]BU 1.2.7; 1.3.9; *Jaiminīya Upaniṣad* 3.12.5.

तज्ज्ञानोत्पत्तिविघ्नाय (?प) ध्वस्तिकृज्ज्ञानलब्धये ।।
उद्गीथदेवतावाप्त्यै प्रारब्धेहोत्तरा श्रुति ।। ७ ।।

Now here starts the later (portion of the) Śruti in order that one is able to obtain the knowledge that destroys the obstacle[1] to the rise of the knowledge of that (Sūtrātman), and that one obtains (the knowledge of) the deity of the Udgītha. [7]

[1]The text of AnSS reads *vighnāya....labdhaye*, but it should read *vighnāpadhvasti*...as shown by the edition of NKḶ and by SP's explanation. The first line in AnSS text as it is is understood as an instance of *sāpekṣa samāsa*.

ननु मृत्योरतिक्रान्तेरुद्गीथज्ञानकर्मणोः ।।
फलस्य संश्रवान्नातो मृत्युप्राप्तिस्तयोः फलम् ।। ८ ।।

[Now an objection is raised on the basis of BU 1.3.12: *mṛtyum atikrānto dīpyate*.]

But, since one hears that the result of (ritual) activity and Udgītha-*jñāna* (joined together) is transcending[1] Mṛtyu[2], therefore, obtaining Mṛtyu (i.e. oneness with it) from them (viz. Udgītha-*jñāna* and ritual activity) is not the reward of the two. [8]

[1]Cf. *so 'gnir abhavat*, (BU 1.3.12)... *sa vāyur abhavat* etc.
[2]That is to say: becoming one with Mṛtyu = Sūtrātman.

नाग्न्यादिदेवतात्मत्वतत्फलावगमाच्छ्रुतेः ।।
स्वाभाविकासङ्गमृत्योरतिक्रान्तिः पृथक्फलम् ।। ९ ।।

[This is an answer to the preceding.]

(This is) not (so), because (one hears) from the Śruti[1] that (the knowledge of) the result of that is oneness with the deities, Agni etc.[2] As for transcending Mṛtyu, (it consists in transcending) natural attachment (to bodily and other pleasures) (and) is (thus) a distinct reward. [9]

[1]Sp cites: *etāsāṁ devatānām eko bhavati* (BU 1.2.7) and *so 'gnir abhavat* (BU 1.3.12) etc. mentioned in note 1 on the preceding verse.
[2]These are already mentioned in BUBV 1.2.

कोऽसौ स्वाभाविकः पाप्मा तस्योद्भूतिस्तथा कुतः ।।
तस्मान्निवृत्तिः केन स्यात्कथं वेत्येतदुच्यते ।। १० ।।

[This verse states in brief the purpose of the narrative.]

What (then) is that natural defect (lit. sin)? so also, whence does it come into existence? by what would there be keeping away from it possible? and how? — all this is discussed (in what follows.) [10]

यथोक्तार्थप्रसिद्धयर्थं श्रुतिराख्यायिकात्मिका ।।
द्वया हेत्येवमाद्येयं प्रचक्राम परीक्षितुम् ।। ११ ।।

In order to establish the things mentioned (thus)[1], this Śruti passage, which is of the nature of a narrative, proceeds to discuss (lit. examine or explain) (the nature of Prāṇa)[2], beginning with (the words) *dvayā ha.* [11]

[1]This refers to the questions mentioned in the preceding verse.
[2]It is the Udgīthadevatā, so-called in verse 7 above, the real nature of Prāṇa as pure, unaffected by any attachment to worldly objects and pleasure.

प्राजापत्यं पदं यो यो ह्यधिकारी परीप्सति ।।
तन्निर्धार्यानया श्रुत्या पदमाप्नोत्युपासनात् ।। १२ ।।

Verily, whosoever, entitled (to the Udgītha worship)[1], wishes to get the status of Prajāpati, attains it, having first ascertained that[2] by means of this Śruti[3] and then by performing the worship[4] (of Prāṇa). [12]

[1]SP seems to refer this to the one who is entitled to perform Soma sacrifice.
[2]The nature of Prāṇa having the qualities like purity etc.
[3]BU 1.3.
[4]For the word *upāsanā* we use 'worship', since BU, BUB and BUBV appear to use it in different places with different nuances which are covered by this word. We shall specify the exact nuance wherever desirable. Cf. Introduction.

Sureśvara's discussion on BU 1.3.1 begins here and continues up to verse 126, touching various allied topics in passing.

पूर्वजन्मनि यद्वृत्तं वर्तमानप्रजापतेः ।।
तदवद्योतको हेति निपातोऽत्र प्रयुज्यते ।। १३ ।।

The particle *ha* here[1] is used as indicative[2] of what happened in the previous life of the present day Prajāpati. [13]

Sureśvara refers to the changing cycle of Kalpas and, accordingly, even to the merger of Prajāpati into the Brahman for being born again as Prajāpati in every subsequent Kalpa.

[1]The word *atra* is an adverb in locative sense and refers to the statement of the first line.

[2]SP points out that particles do not express any meaning, they only indicate the same. This refers to the view mentioned in *Nirukta* 1.4: *nāmākhyātayos tu karmopasaṁyogadyotakā bhavanti.*

भविष्यद्वृत्तिमाश्रित्य यजमानः प्रजापतिः ।।
इहाभिधीयतेऽन्यस्तु न कश्चित्सप्रयोजनः ।। १४ ।।

Here is mentioned (as) the sacrificer Prajāpati, with his future status[1] in view, and not any other (sacrificer) who has (some other) purpose.[2] [14]

[1]This is literally 'modification or transformation of a human sacrificer into Prajāpati (=Prāṇa)'.

[2]An ordinary sacrificer who wishes to achieve results of ritual actions such as riches etc., but not the status of Prāṇa. Those results are only temporary!

ज्ञानकर्मोपदेशो हि नरं प्रत्येव सर्वथा ।।
सर्वः श्रौतो यतस्तस्मात्स एवेहाभिधीयते ।। १५ ।।

Since, everywhere the instruction of the Śruti[1] for (every) individual is in every way in respect of knowledge and activity, therefore, it is only that (individual sacrificer)[2] who is mentioned here. [15]

[1]NKL understands *sarvaḥ* in the sense of both the Śrauta and the Smārta instruction; cf. *śrautaḥ smārtaś ca sarvaprakāra ity arthaḥ.*

[2]That sacrificer means such a sacrificer as wishes to know both the nature of the diety as Prāṇa and the procedure of the performance.

तत्कर्मज्ञानजत्वाच्च तत्प्राणाः शुद्ध्यशुद्धिजाः ।।
प्राजापत्या इहोच्यन्ते वागाद्युक्तेश्च लिङ्गतः ।। १६ ।।

[This explains *tasyaiva prajāpateḥ*...(BUB p. 44).]

Further, here are mentioned the very *prāṇas* (sense-organs)[1] of that (sacrificer), produced as they are by his (ritual) activities and knowledge (in the earlier life or lives) as also from purity and impurity, as the off-springs of Prajāpati, because there is an indication (of the same) from the statement of Speech and others[2]. [16]

This verse explains the significance of the suffix which forms the word *Prājāpatya* from *Prajāpati*.

[1]For *prāṇa* in the sense of organs cf. BSB 2.4.1; 2.4.5 (and also in later verses of this Brāhmaṇa).

[2]They refer to BU 1.3.3ff. referring to Nose, Eye, Ear, *manas* etc.

उद्गीथोपास्तिसंबन्धाद्द्वया हेत्यादिकस्य च ।।
उपास्यार्थविशुद्ध्यर्था प्रवृत्ताख्यायिका ततः ।। १७ ।।

And, therefore, because of the relation of the words *dvayā ha*... to the worship of the Udgītha, the narrative (here) has begun with the purpose of explaining clearly the nature (lit. the meaning) of the object of worship. [17]

Both SP and NKL point out that the narrative has inherent connection with the worship of Udgītha.

अभ्यारोहजपस्येह प्राण एवास्तु देवता ।।
कस्माद्वागादयो नेति तत्परीक्षात ईर्यते ।। १८ ।।

Therefore, there follows (lit. is put forth) an examination (of the thought as to) why Prāṇa should be (accepted) in this section (as) the deity of (the Abhyārohajapa=) the recitation for elevation[1], and not Speech and others. [18]

[1]This refers to BU 1.3.28: *asato mā sad gamaya....mṛtyor mā amṛtaṁ gamaya*. This recitation forms a part of the Udgīha worship as will be clear later.

अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां प्राणप्राधान्यसिद्धये ।।
प्रवृत्ताख्यायिका यत्नाद्वागादीन्द्रियनिन्दया ।। १९ ।।

Therefore, with a view to establishing the pre-eminence of Prāṇa by means of (the method of) Anvaya and Vyatireka[1], the narrative has begun specifically with the censure[2] of the organ of speech and others. [19]

[1]Read SP: *sati prāṇe vāgādivyāpāro nānyathā.*
[2]This is a literal translation of *nindā,* but the word *nindā* indicates here rejection.

शास्त्रस्वभावजज्ञानकर्मसंस्कारहेतुतः ।।
देवासुरत्वं प्राणानां नि(?वि)रुद्धोपाधिकारणात् ।। २० ।।

The *prāṇas* (i.e. sense-organs) become possessed of the nature of gods and demons on account of the impressions of knowledge and activity which have resulted from (the teaching of) the scriptures and from their own nature, i.e. thus owing to the limiting adjuncts which are opposed[1] (in nature to one another). [20]

[1]Translation follows the edition of NKL and SP which read *viruddhopādhi*...even though AnSS reads *niruddhopādhi,* obviously it is a mis-reading.

सहस्रादिर्यथा भेदः प्राणस्यैकस्य शब्द्यते ।।
भूयोधिकारभेदेन वागादीनां तथा भिदा ।। २१ ।।

[Reference is made to *kati devā yajñavalkya iti* (BU 3.9.1), a question put to Yājñavalkya, the seer of BU.]

As it is said of one and the same Prāṇa that it has distinct forms (which are) counted (in) thousand etc., so also (is there) the division[1] of Speech and others, owing to the difference in their manifold (i.e. varied) capacity[2]. [21]

[1]The words 'into different forms' are to be supplied.

[2]This refers to the *upādhis* mentioned in the previous verse, *śāstrīya* and *itara* (=*svābhāvika*) *jñānakarmāṇī*.

सहजं सर्वभूतानां वृत्तमासुरमिष्यते ।।
यत्नाधेयं यतो दैवं ज्यायांसः स्युस्ततोऽसुराः ।। २२ ।।

Since the natural behaviour (lit. activity) of all beings is described (as) demoniac (and) any divine activity has to be performed with effort, therefore, the demons are elders (lit. larger) in number. [22]

It is everyone's experience that the demoniac activities outnumber the divine activities, because it is in the nature of human beings to turn to the former, whereas the latter require special efforts.

इह वागादयः शब्दा देवतार्थाभिधायकाः ।।
मर्त्यत्वान्न तु गृह्यन्ते करणस्थानगोचराः ।। २३ ।।

Here (i.e. in this section) the words *vāc* 'Speech' and others are expressive of (their relevant) deities and they are not taken to have the specific organs (of their activity) as their object (as their primary meaning), on account of their perishability (lit. mortality). [23]

देवतैकात्म्यमेवेह दैवज्ञानक्रियाफलम् ।।
अध्यात्मादिपरिच्छेद आसुरत्वान्न गृह्यते ।। २४ ।।

Here (i.e. in this Brāhmaṇa) only (attaining) oneness with the deity[1] is accepted as the result of the knowledge of the divine and the activity directed towards the divine. Limitation in the form of the body etc.[2] is not (so) accepted, because it is demoniac (in its origin)[3]. [24]

This is one more argument for understanding *devatā* from the words *vāc* and others.

[1]This refers to the sentences like *so 'gnir abhavat* (BU 1.3.12 ff.)

[2]The word 'etc.' refers to *rāga*, *lobha* etc.

[3]It is *āsaṅgaja*.

हिंसाभिप्रवणं चेतः प्रायेण श्रेयसामपि ।।
भूयांसोऽतोऽसुरा देवाः कनीयांसोऽतियत्नजाः ।। २५ ।।

Generally, the mind even of the elite is prone to violence. Therefore, the demons are larger[1], in number and the gods, who originate from the (necessary) great effort (towards the activities prescribed by scripture), are smaller (lit. younger) in number. [25]

[1]Larger and smaller in translation contrast with each other. Cf. verse 22 above.

धर्माधर्मैकसाध्यत्वाद्ब्रह्मादेः स्थावरावधेः ।।
अस्पर्धन्त ततोऽन्योन्यं दैतेया विबुधैः सह ।। २६ ।।

[This explains *lokeṣu nimittabhūteṣu*...(BUB p. 45)]

Since (the origin of this universe), beginning with the Brahman and ending with all that is steady, is effected from only (the practice of) merit and demerit, therefore[1], the sons of Diti and the gods rivalled with one another. [26]

[1]This is explained by SP as *svābhāviketarajñānavaśāt*.

आसुरेभ्योऽधिकारेभ्यो व्युत्थाप्येह प्रजापतिम् ।।
दैवीर्भूमीर्नयामैनमिति देवचिकीर्षितम् ।। २७ ।।

[Verses 27-29 are the explanation of verse 26 above.]

What the gods wished to do was: 'Let us raise Prajāpati here (in the manifest universe) from his demoniac dispositions[1] and lead this one to the levels[2] of the divine.' [27]

[1]Prajāpati (Hiraṇyagarbha) is conceived as the first sacrificer. In this regard, cf. BUBV 1.2.205-6. The word *adhikāra* literally means 'capacity for activity enjoined on the sacrificer (Prajāpati) by scripture', but here is meant his proneness to undertake the sacrificial activities.

[2]The plural is used in view of many sacrificers, each of whom is a Prajāpati.

दैवेभ्य एनमाच्छिद्य कामक्रोधादिसाधनाः ॥
आनयामासुरीर्भूमीरिति दैतेयनिश्चितिः ॥ २८ ॥

(As against this), the decision of the sons of Diti was: Let us, who are possessed of various means such as *kāma, krodha* etc., cut this one, viz. the sacrificer, (away) from his divine (dispositions) and bring him to the levels of the demons.' [28]

यत्नायत्नसमुत्थाभ्यां वृत्तिभ्यां देवदानवाः ॥
दैव्यासुरीभ्यामन्योन्यमस्पर्धन्त विरोधतः ॥ २९ ॥

[This explains *devānaṁ ca* (BUB p. 45).]

(Thus) the gods and the demons, who were possessed of the divine and the demoniac temperaments respectively (for) activities (which can be accomplished) with effort and without it (i.e. the effort[1]), rivalled mutually, owing the opposition (in respect of their ends.) [29]

[1]This refers to men's *svābhāvika karman*; cf. *svabhāvaja* in verse 20 above.

भूयो बलेन ते देवा आसुरेण निराश्रयाः ॥
अर्द्यमाना न शरणं लेभिरेऽल्पत्वकारणात् ॥ ३० ॥

[This explains *evaṁ kanīyastvād abhibhūyamānāḥ* (BUB p. 45).]

Those gods, who were much (*bhūyaḥ*) oppressed by the demoniac strength[1] on account of the smallness (in their number), were without any support, (and) they did not find a shelter (i.e. protection). [30]

[1]Or alternatively, 'who were oppressed by the greater strength of the demons...' (read *bhūyobalena*).

अनीक्षमाणास्ते शर्म संभूयोचुः परस्परम् ॥
क्रियतामविचारेण हन्तेत्यनुमतौ पदम् ॥ ३१ ॥

They (gods), not finding (lit. seeing) any shelter[1] assembled together and talked among themselves—(in this con-

text) the word *hanta* (in the Śruti sentence *hantāsurān...*) is expressive of the agreement (amongst them thus): 'Let (this) be done without a (moment's) thought[2]— [31]

[1]Or alternatively, 'happiness (in store for themselves)'.
[2]This is parenthetical; the next verse is the gods' speech.

अस्मज्जिगीषूनसुराञ्जित्वोद्गात्रात्मसंश्रयात् ।।
अतिलङ्घ्यासुरं भावं देवतात्मानमाप्नुमः ।। ३२ ।।

'Let us, having conquered the demons who wish to conquer us, by resorting to the nature of the Udgātṛ[1], overcome the demoniac state (that has befallen us) and attain the divine status.' [32]

[1]This explains *udgīthena* (BU 1.3.1), following BUB on it, viz. *udgīthakarmapadārthakartṛsvarūpāśrayeṇa* 'resorting to the agent of the ritual called the Udgītha' (BUB p. 46). This emphasises the superior mystic power of the Udgātṛ priest, who is (later on shown as) identical with Prāṇa.

उद्गीथदेवतावाप्तिर्ज्ञानकर्मसमुच्चयात् ।।
अभ्यारोहजपः कर्म ज्ञानं त्विह परीक्ष्यते ।। ३३ ।।

The attainment of the (nature of) the deity of the Udgītha becomes possible on account of the combination of the knowledge and the activity (i.e. performance of the Udgāna). Here (i.e. in this regard), the recitation for elevation is the activity.[1] But here (i.e. in what follows) is examined (only) knowledge[2]. [33]

[1]Cf. verse 18 above.
[2]It is the knowledge of the nature of Prāṇa, the deity of the Udgītha.

विधिशेषार्थवादत्वान्नेदं ज्ञाननिरूपणम् ।।
इति चेन्नैतदेवं स्यादेवं वेदेति तद्विधेः ।। ३४ ।।

[Verses 34-40 refute the supposition that the narrative *dvayā ha*...does not intend to be an exposition of knowledge.]

If (one were to say:) 'This is not a discussion of knowledge, for it is a eulogistic statement (Arthavāda) about the remainder of the injunction.[1]', (we say:) 'This could not be be so (understood), for there is an injunction (regarding the recitation) in (the sentence) *evaṁ veda*.' [34]

[1]Injunction regarding recitation of the formula for elevation; this means: *evaṁ veda* (=*evaṁ vidyāt*), itself being formally an injunction, cannot be a statement eulogistic or ancillary to any other injunction. The objection is to be understood thus: "Is this narrative to be considered as ancillary to *japavidhi*? or to *udgīthavidhi*?", as pointed out by NKL.

उद्गीथविधिशेषश्चेदुद्गीथप्रकृतौ श्रवात् ॥
नातत्प्रकरणान्न्याय्यमितोऽन्यत्र च तद्विधेः ॥ ३५ ॥

(Then) if (one were to say:) 'This is an ancillary to the performance (which is meant) in the injunction regarding the Udgītha, i.e. the recitation of the Udgītha, on account of its being heard (i.e. stated in the Śruti) with reference to the injunction regarding the Udgītha', (our answer is:) It is not reasonable (to say so), since the context is not of that (viz. the Udgītha); and also because the injunction regarding that is prescribed elsewhere.' [35]

According to NKL, the first alternative which is discussed in verse 34 was regarding Abhyārohajapa and the other regarding *udgīthavidhi*, in verse 35. SP points out the purport of this objection thus: The statement *dvayā ha*...is made in the nearness of the prescription of the activity of the Udgātṛ which is the principal action and therefore *dvayā ha*...does not form a part of the exposition of knowledge.

विद्याप्रकरणत्वाच्च नेहोद्गीथो विधीयते ॥
जपस्य चाप्यनित्यत्वात्स्यादेवंवित्प्रयोज्यता ॥ ३६ ॥

(And) because there is here the context of knowledge, the Udgītha is not prescribed here. Yet (*ca*) the recitation (for elevation), not being compulsory, it has to be enjoined for one who knows[1]. [36]

SP points out that Abhyārohajapa is prescribed also for one who has the knowledge of the nature of Prāṇa. It is not a compulsory requirement for such a knower. This implies that, even before the recitation, one may have known the nature of Prāṇa.

[1]'One who knows the purpose of the Udgītha Upāsanā.'

उदारफलवद्यस्मादपि ज्ञानमिह श्रुतम् ।।
तद्धैतदित्यतो ज्ञानं फलवत्त्वाद्विधित्सितम् ।। ३७ ।।

Also because here is heard knowledge as yielding abundant fruit, therefore, in the statement *tadd haitat*,....it is intended to prescribe knowledge owing to its having (an excellent) result[1]. [37]

The prescription for knowledge means prescription of the Upāsanā of the Udgītha.

[1]The variant noted in SP in the AnSS *tasmāt tatphalavattvāt* is better and therefore it is followed in the translation.

शुद्ध्यशुद्ध्युक्तितश्चेह प्राणोपासा विवक्षिता ।।
वागादिनिन्दया मुख्यप्राणोपासा न चेदिह ।। ३८ ।।
विधित्सिताथ तन्निन्दा स्तुतिश्चानस्य किंफला ।।
अतोऽर्थवादाद्धि विधिर्लिङ्गादत्रानुमीयते ।। ३९ ।।

And it is intended here to state the Upāsanā of Prāṇa as there is the statement about purity and impurity (regarding Prāṇa and others). If, by the censure of Speech and others, the worship of the principal Prāṇa [38]
was not sought to be prescribed, then (the question is:) 'What is the result of the censure of that (Speech)? and of the praise of Prāṇa[1]?' Therefore, in this context[2], we infer the injunction (regarding knowledge) from Arthavāda[3] 'the statement of (its) ancillary,' the cause of (or reason for) inference. [39]

The argument uses the method of Anvaya and Vyatireka.
[1]The word *ana* means Prāṇa.
[2]The word *prakaraṇe* is to be supplied after *atra*.
[3]Namely, *vāgādinindā*.

प्राणस्वरूपापत्तिश्च यतोपासाफलं श्रुतम् ।।
उपासनमतोऽनस्य विधित्सितमितीक्ष्यताम् ।। ४० ।।

Since[1] the result of the Upāsanā is heard (to be one's) coming to obtain the nature of Prāṇa, therefore, it should be understood (lit. seen) that (in this context of the narrative) the worship of Prāṇa is sought to be prescribed. [40]

[1]SP points out that there is double Saṁdhi in *yatopāsāphalam* which is equal to *yata upāsāphalam*; this indicates the archaic tendency in Sureśvara's composition.

Verses 41-48 *refute the supposition that Prāṇa, the object of an Upāsanā is 'possessed of properties like purity etc.' (like any other object)—this implies opposition to the idea of nirguṇa Brahman.*

उपासनमसोः काममस्तु सूक्तोपपत्तितः ।।
शुद्ध्यादिगुणवत्ता तु न मानादुपपद्यते ।। ४१ ।।

[This explains *bhavatu nāma prāṅasyopāsanam* (BUB p.47).]

(One might oppose thus:) 'Granted that the worship of Prāṇa is (understood here) on the basis of the supporting reason (which is) well adduced (lit. stated) above, yet (in the case of Prāṇa) being possessed of excellence such as purity etc.[1] does not follow from the authoritative means (adopted by you)[2].' [41]

[1]Cf. verse 38 above.
[2]The word *māna* in the last part of the verse stands for *sūkta* which is mentioned in the earlier half; it refers to the *śabdapramāṇa*, i.e. Śruti.

गुणवत्ताप्यसोरस्तु यथास्योपासनं तथा ।।
प्रामाणिक्युभयत्रापि प्राप्तिर्यस्मादिहेक्ष्यते ।। ४२ ।।

(The answer to this is:) 'Let it be (understood in the case) of Prāṇa that there is excellence also (as stated in the Śruti), since its worship (is understood); and also because,

in respect of both[1], the authoritativeness (of the Śruti) is desired (i.e. accepted) here (i.e. in the injunction regarding the worship of Udgītha).' [42]

This argument is based on *devatādhikaraṇanyāya* (BS 1.3.26-33).

[1]It means *upāsanā* and *prāṇadevatāśuddhi*. A well-known verse, viz. "*vigraho haviṣām bhoga aiśvaryaṁ ca prasannatā/ phalapradānam ity etat pañcakaṁ vigrahādikam//*" justifies this argument.

ननु स्युत्यर्थतैवास्य शुद्धचादेरवगम्यते ।।
उपासाविधिशेषत्वादर्थवादोऽत ईक्ष्यताम् ।। ४३ ।।

[This explains *sa syāt* (BUB p. 47) in answer to the objection *syāt śrutatvāt*.]

(A counter argument is:) One might say: 'From purity etc. is understood only the praiseworthiness of this (Prāṇa), since it is subsidiary to the injunction regarding the Upāsanā. Therefore, let it (viz. the statement of purity etc.) be understood as Arthavāda.' [43]

प्रामाणिकोऽभिसंबन्धो यस्मात्प्राणस्य गम्यते ।।
किं बलं समुपाश्रित्य शुद्धचादेरर्थवादता ।। ४४ ।।

(We answer:) 'Since the relation of Prāṇa (to excellence etc.) is understood as authoritative, (then tell us) resorting to which strength[1] (you understand) the statement of purity etc. as Arthavāda.' [44]

[1]It means 'strong proof'.

नहि मानं विहायेह साध्यसाधननिश्चितौ ।।
चक्षुरन्यत्प्रपश्यामो यद्बलात्स्यादयं मृषा ।। ४५ ।।

'Indeed we do not know (lit. see or find) here (in Śāstric dealings) any eye[1], leaving aside the means of knowing (viz. the Śruti) for purposes of deciding what is to be proven and what the means of proving it, whereby this one[2] could be considered as false.' [45]

[1]That is to say: the means of knowing.

[2]It means 'the Śruti which we have adduced as a proof of knowing that Prāṇa is possessed of excellence etc.'

आसन्यत्वादयोऽन्यस्य न च योषाग्निवद्यतः ।।
तेषां प्रत्यक्षतः सिद्धेरतः शुद्धयादिमानसुः ।। ४६ ।।

Since the qualities such as (ever) abiding in the mouth[1] do not belong to anyone else (than Prāṇa) in the same way as (the character of) fire in a woman, because that (matter) is established (in its true nature) by direct perception; therefore, Prāṇa is (established as) possessed of purity etc. [46]

[1]This is the force of the suffix *ya* added to *āsan*.

अक्षाद्यविषया ये तु गुणा आगमतो मताः ।।
मानाविरोधात्केनैषां शुद्धयादीनां मृषार्थता ।। ४७ ।।

By (what reason then) can these, viz. purity etc., as qualities of Prāṇa, though not the object of the eyes etc. (and) known from Āgama, be false, when there is no opposition to the (authoritative) means (viz. Śruti)? [47]

श्रोत्रादिवत्प्रमाणानामसाधारणमेयता ।।
तन्मेयप्रथने मानं न किंचिदनुभूतितः ।। ४८ ।।

Like the ears etc., the various other means of knowing (also) have their own special objects of knowledge. (Consequently), there is nothing else than (one's own) experience which serves as a means of knowing which can reveal the object to be known[1]. [48]

[1]*tanmeyaprathane* of AnSS edition (also SP agrees) is read in the NKL as *tanmeyagrathaṇe*. NKL paraphrases it as *mānameyasambandhe* (which is *viṣayaviṣayisambandhe*, following the note by the editor of NKL). Translation follows SP.

Verses 49-65 *explain that, since falsity is difficult to explain, purity etc. of Prāṇa are not false.*

परमार्थातिरेकाद्वाभेदाद्वा परमार्थतः ।।
वस्तुनः स्यान्मृषात्मत्वं नैवमप्युपपद्यते ।। ४९ ।।

(A questions is asked:) 'Whether the nature of falsity of the existential entity, viz. Prāṇa, would be in addition to (i.e. besides or apart from) the ultimate reality, or as non-distinct from that reality.' (The answer is:) 'Thus also, it cannot be explained.' [49]

The qualities attributed to Prāṇa, viz. purity etc. are disputed. There are two alternatives posited: (i) Prāṇa is distinct from the ultimate reality; and (ii) Prāṇa is not distinct from it.

लभते व्यतिरेकं चेत्परमार्थात्ततोऽपरम् ।।
स्वमहिम्नैव तत्सिद्धेः किमिव स्यान्मृषार्थता ।। ५० ।।

If it has distinction from the ultimate reality, then (this) other[1] has its proof (i.e. gets established) by its own strength.[2] What would (then) be 'being false object'? [50]

This answers away the first alternative.

[1]Namely, Prāṇa which is posited as false.

[2]This falsity has to be declared as self-established, for there is not seen any connection of it whatever with either the Reality or a non-existent.

परमार्थात्मकत्वे तु न किंचिद्वितथं क्वचित् ।।
असत्यस्याप्यसत्यत्वं परमार्थसदात्मना ।। ५१ ।।

As against this, no thing which has the nature of the ultimate reality can anywhere (or ever) be untrue because the untruth of the untrue also would be of the nature of the ultimate reality. [51]

This answers away the second alternative mentioned in verse 49 above.

This points to the Reality which is explained by SP thus: *asatyasyāpi svarūpaṁ sadvastvātmanā vācyam ato bhedapakṣānupapatteḥ sad advaitam ity arthaḥ.*

सत्यासत्यविभागोऽयमविभागात्मवस्तुनि ।।
प्रत्यगज्ञानहेतूत्थस्तद्बोधादेव तद्धतिः ।। ५२ ।।

This division of the true and the false is in respect of that thing which is of the nature of what is partless (and) it (viz. the division) arises from the cause, viz. ignorance, regarding (the nature of) the inner self. On knowing (the nature of) that[1] (viz. the inner self), there occurs the destruction of that (viz. ignorance). [52]

This verse is an answer to the possible objection: Even the Siddhāntin holds the division of the universe into true and false; (cf. *satyānṛte mithumīkṛtya...vyavahāraḥ* in Śaṅkara's BSB (*adhyāsabhāṣya*).)

[1]The first *tat* 'that' refers to the *pratyak* and the second to ignorance about its nature.

This explains the effect of the knowledge of the real absence of division into true and false.

स्वाभासफलकारूढस्तदज्ञानजभूमिषु ।।
तत्स्थोऽपि तदसंबद्ध ईश्वराद्यात्मतां गतः ।। ५३ ।।

(The Self) which has mounted on the plank in the form of its own appearance[1] in the states resulting from the ignorance of itself (*sva*) is not connected with them, even while existing in them, and has (later) become identical with Īśvara and others.[2]

This is an explanation of *tadbodhāt eva taddhatiḥ* in the preceding verse.

[1]This refers to Sureśvara's theory of Ābhāsa 'appearance'.

[2]The word 'etc.' stands for *sākṣin*, *kāraṇa*, *antaryāmin* (SP); cf. *avidyākṛtanāmarūpopādhyanurodhīśvaro bhavati* (BSB 2.1.14). In other words, the expressions Īśvara etc. also are owing to the ignorance about the Reality.

तदज्ञानं तदुत्थं च जगत्कृत्स्नं तदात्मकम् ।।
यतोऽतस्तदनूद्याह ह्यात्मैवेति श्रुतिः स्फुटम् ।। ५४ ।।

Since ignorance about that (ultimate reality) and the entire world which, having the nature of that (Īśvara), has arisen from that, therefore, having restated that, indeed, has the Śruti clearly said '*ātmā ...eva*'[1] [54]

This verse points to an authoritative Śruti in support of the argument in the preceding verse, viz. *seśvaraṁ jagad āvidyam.*

[1]This should refer to *ātmety evopāsīta....*

ऐकात्म्यमेव मानानां सर्वेषां मेयमिष्यते ।।
यथा तथा प्रवक्ष्याम उदर्केऽप्युपपत्तिभिः ।। ५५ ।।

Even[1] in later portion[2], we shall explain with cogent arguments (and) in such a way as shows that all the means of knowing can be said to have only the oneness of the Ātman as the object of knowing[3]. [55]

[1]The word *api* 'even' refers to what is said in SV.

[2]The word *udarke* refers to the discussion of *vyākṛta* according to SP and *avyākṛta* according to the editor of NKL!

[3]Cf NKL: *dvaitasya mithyātve pratyakṣāder anālambanasyāmānatvam* (the editor explains: *anālambanasya* as *vastvaviṣayakasya*).

मिथ्येतिप्रत्ययोत्पत्तिस्तथा कारणदोषतः ।।
बाध्यज्ञानस्य हेतुः स्यान्नातोऽन्यद्बाध्यकारणम् ।। ५६ ।।

So also the rise of the knowledge, that the notion of (Prāṇa's purity etc.) is false, would be, owning to (some) fault in reasoning[1], the cause of knowledge to be stultified. There cannot, therefore, be anything else than this as the cause[2] (of the knowledge) to be stultified. [56]

This verse is intended to explain the need of knowing the uniqueness of the Reality (*aikātmya*) because the objector would raise an objection: 'Since the Śruti expressive of the uniqueness of the Reality is false, there is no means to prove it, viz. the uniqueness.' It explains the cause of the unauthoritative knowledge. This has a basis in verse 50 above.

[1]This refers to reasoning (*jñāpaka*).
[2]This refers to the so-called productive cause (*kāraka*).

न चेहोभयमप्यस्ति कुतो मिथ्येति भण्यते ॥
मितेर्मेये समाप्तत्वान्मिथ्यात्वं न मितेर्भवेत् ॥ ५७ ॥

(One would then ask:) 'In this case[1], both of them[2] are not noticed (to exist); why is it then said to be false? (The answer is:) Knowledge (is said to) have occurred when the object of knowledge is obtained;[3] whatever is knowledge cannot be false.' [57]

[1]The word *iha* stands for *śrutijanya-aikātmya-jñāna*.
[2]This means 'there is no *kāraṇadoṣa* and no *svarūpadoṣa*'; cf. note on the preceding verse.
[3]This obtaining is in reality the becoming one of the so-called knower and the so-called object of his knowing; cf. SP: *miter aikyabodhasya meye paramārthasatye paryavasānāt*.

तस्मादविपरीतार्थज्ञानाच्छ्रेयो ह्यवाप्यते ॥
विपरीतार्थतायास्तु न हेतुर्जगतीक्ष्यते ॥ ५८ ॥

[*aviparītārthapratipatteḥ*...(BUB p. 47) is explained.]

Therefore, bliss is certainly[1] obtained from the knowledge of the (Real) object which is not otherwise (grasped). However, no purpose is known (lit. seen) in this world for (the Real) object being known as otherwise.[2] [58]

[1]It seems from SP that the verse read as...*cchreyo avāpyate* (without the Saṁdhi of *o* and *a*; but only without any purpose! *hi* 'certainly' makes it quite emphatic. Read SP: *samyagbodhādhīnā śreyovāptir iti sthāṇvādau prasiddham iti vaktuṁ hiśabdaḥ, visaṁdhīpāṭhas tv aphalatvād upekṣitaḥ*.
[2]Earlier it was pointed out that the purpose of the knowledge of the Real as it is securing liberation. There is however no purpose served by understanding it otherwise. Read in this context BUB (p. 47): *yo hy aviparītam artham pratipadyate loke sa iṣṭam prāpnoty aniṣṭād vā nivartate, na viparītārthapratipattyā*.

वस्तुनिष्ठैव मा यस्मान्न तदज्ञानजाश्रया ।।
तस्मात्तन्मोहविध्वस्तौ ध्वस्तिः स्यान्मोहजस्य च ।। ५९ ।।

Since valid knowledge[1] depends only on (the knowledge of) the (Real) object itself and not dependent (lit. resting) on what is produced from the ignorance about it,[2] therefore, when there is destruction of the ignorance of that, there follows the destruction of what is produced from (that) ignorance. [59]

The argument in this verse is based on the acceptance even by the Siddhāntin that knowledge arising from words is *viparīta* 'false', for it has for it an object that is connected with (i.e. affected by) *upādhis* and that which is not directly experienced by one. Cf. SP: *asaṁsṛṣṭāparokṣaṁ vastv ekam evādvitīyaṁ yatsākṣyād ityādiśruteḥ...*

[1]*mā=pramā.*

[2]It refers to *vastu* 'Real object'. Here we feel the cryptic or terse way of Sureśvara's writing: *vastuniṣṭhā=vastu(yāthārthya)–niṣṭhā.* In *tadajñāna...tat* refers only to *vastu.*

न चैवं सति मानानां द्व्यवर्थता स्यात्कथंचन ।।
यथाभूतार्थबोधित्वमेवमेव मितेर्भवेत् ।। ६० ।।

This being the situation, the means of knowledge would not in any way give rise to the knowledge of twofold nature (viz. both real and unreal)[1]. Only thus there would be the character of the knowledge as informing about the object as it is. [60]

[1]This is to say: the word is used in the sense 'this is right and this is not right'. Cf. SP: *saṁvidekarase mānapravṛttiḥ.*

ईश्वरादिविकल्पानां प्रत्यग्वस्त्वविकल्पितम् ।।
विषयो न मृषाबुद्धिः परमार्थं विना यतः ।। ६१ ।।

Among the various notions of Īśvara and others, the inner self stands uniform[1] (i.e. not variously understood), since an object of knowledge would not be that about which

there arises false knowledge, unless there is some one Reality (to prove that as false). [61]

So far, i.e. from verse 58 up to this verse, Sureśvara refuted the falsity in respect of the purity of the Ātman as understood or implied by the opponent of Vedānta. Now, this verse aims to point out how the Siddhānta differs from Śūnyavāda.

[1]That is to say: various notions cannot be formed about it.

यावत्किंचिन्मितेः प्राप्तं न तन्मिथ्या मितत्वतः ॥
मिथ्येति ग्राहयच्छास्त्रमनर्थार्थं यतो भवेत् ॥ ६२ ॥
नाम्नि ब्रह्मेति दृष्टं चेन्न भेदप्रतिपत्तितः ॥
प्रतिमावद्धि नामादौ ज्ञाते ब्रह्मेति धीरियम् ॥ ६३ ॥

[Sureśvara now states in verses 62-65 a second (i.e. an alternative) meaning of the word *prakaraṇa* (BUB p. 47): *nāviparītārtha* ...in respect of the falsity associated with Prāṇa by an opponent. The second line of verse 63 explains *na pratimāvad*...(BUB p. 48).]

'Whatever is obtained from the knowledge of the means of knowing (viz. the Śruti)[1] cannot be false on account of its being known (from the Śruti), because scriptures would be (considered as) conveying some undesirable information, if it informed (about the purity of the Ātman) as false.' [62]
(It might be argued:) 'We have already known that the name (etc.) is the Brahman.' (We reply:) 'No, because of the knowledge of the distinction (between the two). This knowledge, viz. (it is) Brahman, (which arises) when a name (etc.) is known, is like (that) when (the true nature of) an image[2] (is known).' [63]

[1]This is in consonance with the Siddhānta position that the knowledge of the Ātman is obtained by only one means, viz. Śruti.

[2]This is explained fully in the following verse.

यथा निर्ज्ञातभेदे हि विष्णुधीरुपलात्मनि ॥
विधीयते तथा नाम्नि ब्रह्मबुद्धिर्विधीयते ॥ ६४ ॥

'As (in common life) they entertain the notion of Viṣṇu in what is in reality a stone, even though the distinction between the two is known, so it is enjoined (in the Śruti to entertain that) a name is to be taken as the Brahman.' [64]

अज्ञातरज्जुतत्त्वो हि रज्जुं सर्पधियेक्षते ।।
नामादौ तु यतो नैवं तस्मादसदिदं वचः ।। ६५ ।।

Indeed, one who has not known the true nature of a rope sees (the rope) with the notion of a serpent. As against this (*tu*), since it is not (i.e. one does not do) so, this (your) say is incorrect (*asat*). [65]

ब्रह्म नैवेह वस्त्वस्ति दृष्टिरेवेति चेन्मतम् ।।
नर्गादिषु सतामेव सत्सु दृष्टिसमन्वयात् ।। ६६ ।।

[Verses 66-68 state and refute the object that the Brahman does not exist and yet is seen in name etc.]

If it is held: 'There does not at all exist an entity (called) the Brahman, it is merely seeing (something as the Brahman).'[1] (We reply:) 'Not so, because in respect of a *ṛc*[2] etc., which are existent (things) indeed, there is seeing connected only with what are existents.[3] [66]

[1]The opponent implies similarity between *nāmni brahmadṛṣṭi* and *rajjvāṁ sarpadṛṣṭi* where (in the pairs) are involved one real and another non-existent.

[2]Cf. CU 1.6.1: *iyam evarg agniḥ sāma.*

[3]SP: *ṛgādiṣu satsu satām pṛthivyādīnām āropadarśanān nāmādāv api saty eva sato brahmaṇo dṛṣṭir āropaṇīyety arthaḥ.* Also SP points to a number of Śruti passages (CU 6.2.1; Kaṭha U 6.13; TU 2.6.1) which declare the reality of the Brahman, and to the discussion on this point in SV.

गौणस्य मुख्यापेक्षत्वान्मुख्यं ब्रह्म विना न सत् ।।
गौणं ब्रह्म यथा गौणो वह्निर्मुख्याग्निपूर्वकः ।। ६७ ।।

'Since what is metaphorically conceived is dependent on what is primarily (intended), therefore, the metaphorically

conceived Brahman is like the metaphorically conceived fire which (fire) has necessarily pre-existed (the man).[1] [67]

[1]This point is clarified in BUB (p. 49-50): *pañcāgnyādiṣu cāgnitvāder gauṇatvān mukhyāgnyādisadbhāvavan nāmādiṣu brahmatvasya gauṇatvān mukhyabrahmasadbhāvopapattiḥ kriyārthaiś cāviśeṣād vidyārthānam.* This is an instance of *gauṇamukhyādhikaraṇanyāya* (Mīmāṁsā Sūtra 3.2.1.1). The commentary cites the known example of metaphorical speech *agniḥ māṇavakaḥ* whose truth depends on the existence of a real fire already known or seen by a speaker.

न चासद्विषया काचिद्बुद्धिर्जगति वीक्ष्यते ।।
सर्वार्थव्यभिचारेऽपि संविदव्यभिचारिणी ।। ६८ ।।

'And there is not known (lit. seen) in the world any knowledge which has some non-existent as its object. (Contrary to this) Sentience (i.e. the knowing one) is ever invariably existent even while all objects[1] (of knowledge) have variance'[2]. [68]

[1]This indicates the structure of any worldly understanding or the so-called knowledge situation, viz. the knower, the object of knowledge, the means of knowing and the decision in knowing; they are time and again referred to in BUBV etc. as *mātrādi.* Sentience is *saṁvid* or *cidvastu.*

[2]That is to say: the so-called objects might or might not exist.

न चापीहागमाभासोऽचोदनालक्षणत्वतः ।।
क्रियार्थैरविशिष्टत्वाद्विद्यार्थोक्तेः परात्मनि ।। ६९ ।।

[Verses 69-77 pertain to the objection that 'the Vedānta sentences are unauthoritative, since they do not have injunctive force' and its refutation.]

And further (one should) not (argue that) 'there is not here (merely) the semblance of a (scriptural) text, because the text is not characterised as injunction(s) and because the statement of the lore in respect of the Ātman is not

marked by (or, does not refer to) some object(s) to be achieved by some action.' [69]

SP points out that the objection in the above is raised by one who is not aware of the portion of the SV (viz. 672ff.) pertaining to his argument: The instruction regarding the knowledge of the Brahman is not authoritative scripture owing to the lack of injunctive force in it.

ज्योतिष्टोमादिका यद्वद्विशिष्टानेकसाधना ।।
एवंक्रमप्रयुक्ताङ्गा तथा चैवंफला क्रिया ।। ७० ।।
अन्यप्रमाणाविषया वाक्यादेवावगम्यते ।।
यथा तथेहापूर्वादिवस्तूक्तेरेव गम्यते ।। ७१ ।।

As the (ritual) activity such as Jyotiṣṭoma etc. which has the means specified (in the scripture) and consists in parts with their order (enjoined) in some way[1] and also has some particular reward, [70]

is not the object of (any) other means of knowing and is known only from the Vedic sentence, so also here (in Vedānta) the (existential) entity (which is described as) *apūrva* and so on[2] becomes known from the statement (in the Śruti). [71]

[1]Literally it means 'such and such'.
[2]Cf. *tad etad brahmāpūrvam anaparam anantaram abāhyam* (BU 2.5.19)

न च वाक्याद्विपर्यस्ता यदि वा संशयात्मिका ।।
बुद्धिरुत्पद्यतेऽस्माकं यथाभूतार्थबोधिनः ।। ७२ ।।

And from the Vedic sentence that informs (us) about the existential entity as it is, there does not arise on our part the knowledge which is either otherwise (than right) or[1] beset with any doubt. [72]

This verse has a basis in the possible doubt that knowledge gained from the Vedic (=Vedāntic) sentence, being like any other knowledge, could be false or subject to doubt.
[1]*yadi vā=atha vā.*

कार्याभावादयुक्तं चेन्नोक्तिबुद्धेस्तथार्थतः ।।
भावनार्थस्य नैवेह भाव्यर्थत्वात्तथार्थता ।।
किंतु मानार्पितत्वात्सा यथाभूतार्थतेष्यते ।। ७३ ।।

If (it is said by the opponent:) 'It is not proper (to hold a *jñānaparavākya* as an injunction) since there is absence of (any) effect to be produced.', (the Vedāntin enswers:) 'This is not so, because the knowledge (which arises) from the statement (of the Śruti) has for its object (that which has that nature)[1]. Since the thing conveyed by the impulse[2] here[3] is a thing to be produced (in future), it does not at all have the nature of that kind (of the thing).' Yet (the Vedāntin answers:) 'That (nature of) the thing conveyed by the (so-called or formal) impulse is the nature of the thing as it is[4], because it is conveyed by the authoritative means (viz. the Śruti)'. [73]

The argument concerns and answers an alternative question regarding the nature of the thing conveyed by an injunction.

[1]*tathārthataḥ* is for *tathārthavattvataḥ*—an instance of Sureśvara's cryptic style, or rather, use of unusual forms in place of the right/precise ones; it stands for *yathābhūtārthavattvataḥ*.

[2]This means 'the force behind any injunction'.

[3]*iha=karmakāṇḍe*—SP and NKL.

[4]The Brahman, as it is or in its true nature, is made known by the so-called injunction, or alternatively, any matter conveyed by any injunction. The injunction is understood here as *ajñātārthajñāpaka*.

नापि तद्विषणायाश्च कार्यत्वात्स्यात्तथार्थता ।।
प्रमाणाभिजनादेव यथाभूतार्थता धियः ।। ७४ ।।

Not also is there authoritativeness[1] of the knowledge arising from that[2] as what is to be produced; (indeed) knowledge has the nature of what has for its object a thing as it is only when it has its origin in what is an authoritative means of knowing. [74]

The argument pertains to what makes the impulse in the Śruti about *jñāna* authoritative.

[1]*tathārthatā=pramāṇatā* (SP), *prāmāṇyam* (NKL).

[3]*taddhiṣaṇā=tasyāḥ* (*śruteḥ janitā*) *buddhiḥ*.

अन्योन्याश्रयतादोषः कार्यप्रमाण्यवादिनः ।। ७५ ।।
प्रमाणाधिगतौ सत्यां पुंसो मेयानुरोधतः ।।
अनुष्ठेयोऽननुष्ठेय इति पश्चान्मतिर्भवेत् ।। ७६ ।।

In the case of him who understands the authoritativeness (of the Śruti sentences) on the basis of what is to be performed, there is the fault, called interdependence, (viz. thus:)— [75]

(Only) after (one has understood a Vedic sentence) in consonance (with the knowledge of) what is to be known (viz. what is to be accomplished), there is the acceptance of (that sentence as) the means of right knowledge; (and, at the same time, it is held that) there results (only) later the knowledge (of what is prescribed as) something to be accomplished or not to be accomplished. [76]

Verse 76 explains the mutual dependence of *pramāṇavākya* and *pramāṇavākyajanitārtha*.

एकरूपं यतो मानं विरुद्धानेकरूपिणाम् ।।
भानुवद्बोधकं दृष्टं नातोऽनुष्ठेयतो मितिः ।। ७७ ।।

Since an authoritative means (of knowing) is, like the Sun, a uniform conveyer (of the objects) which have many mutually opposed forms, therefore, knowledge does not arise (only) from (a rule regarding) what is to be performed. [77]

The nature of an authoritative means of knowing does not depend upon the various or opposed natures of the objects. This is seen from the Sun's revealing objects of all kinds. Therefore, the Śruti can, in the same way, be authoritative in respect of what is to be accomplished and what is not to be accomplished. The important character of the Śruti is that it should be informative of what is not known (from any other source).

नन्ववाक्यप्रमाणत्वमननुष्ठानतो भवेत् ॥
पदानां संहतिर्यस्मान्न दृष्टेह क्रियां विना ॥ ७८ ॥

[Verses 78-83 discuss whether the Brahman is the meaning of word(s) or that of sentence(s).]

It might be argued: 'On account of the absence of effecting (a product), (the statement about the Brahman) would have unauthoritativeness, since no construe of words is seen (as possible) here[1] without (any reference to) any action (connected with the same)'.[2] [78]

This is the argument of the objector: the Brahman is not the meaning of the word(s).

[1]In the Vedic sentence. Such is the view of the Mīmāṁsaka.

[2]This implies the presence of a verb which expresses some action in conjunction with various words in the sentence. In Vedāntic sentences, it is argued, the Brahman which is the subject in them is not connected with action and, therefore, with verbs.

पदार्थत्वे च तत्सिद्धिर्लिङ्गप्रत्यक्षसंश्रयात् ॥
आगमैकप्रमाणत्वान्न पदार्थत्वमिष्यते ॥ ७९ ॥

अस्यस्मीत्यभ्युपेतत्वान्नैवमप्युपपद्यते ॥
अस्ति मेरुर्यथा वर्णचतुष्टयविशेषणः ॥ ८० ॥

अकार्येऽपि हि मेर्वादावस्ति मेरुरिति श्रुतेः ॥
सम्यग्धीर्जायते यद्वत्तथा तत्त्वमसीत्यतः ॥ ८१ ॥

'And that[1] would be established (only) if it[2] were accepted as the meaning of the word(s), by resorting to inference[3] and direct perception; it cannot (however) be accepted that (the Brahman is) the meaning of the word(s) (without any connection with action) having only Śruti as the authoritative means of knowing it.' [79]

'(And) this objection also cannot be considered as reasonable since the verbs *asi* and *asmi* are accepted (as verbs connected with the subject of the sentence, viz. *tat* and *aham* for Brahman). (To explain:) This is (so) because there

occurs in a sentence (the subject) Mt. Meru only qualified by (a word expressive of) four colours (and it is taken as connected with *asti* 'is').' [80]

'As, indeed, in respect of Mt. Meru etc., which is not what is to be accomplished[4], there arises from the Śruti the right knowledge (of it), viz. 'There is Mt. Meru.', so will there arise right knowledge from the statement 'That you are.'. [81]

Verses 79-81 concern the argument of the objector regarding that the Brahman is not the meaning of the word(s).

[1]Namely, connection of words.

[2]Namely, the Brahman.

[3]The word *liṅga* stands for *liṅga-liṅgi-parāmarśa* 'inference'.

[4]The emphasis on *akārye* has be noted.

मेर्वादिज्ञानवच्चेत्स्यान्निष्फलत्वादमानता ।।
नैवं तत्फलसाक्षात्त्वाज्ज्ञानोद्भूतेरनन्तरम् ।। ८२ ।।

If one were to say: 'There is unauthoritativeness (of the Śruti sentence in this case also) as in the case of the knowledge about Mt. Meru etc. owing to their being devoid of any effect', this is not so, since the effect of them (viz. such sentences) has been directly experienced[1] subsequent to the rise (of the knowledge of the Mt. Meru). [82]

[1]The Siddhānta emphasises on the direct experience as an unfailing means to right knowledge; this is in contrast with inference.

भिद्यते हृदयग्रन्थिर्ब्रह्माप्येतीति च श्रुतेः ।।
न चार्थवादतैतस्यां जुह्वामिव फलश्रुतेः ।। ८३ ।।

And (thus we see, in this respect) from the Śruti (statements); 'The knot of heart is broken'[1] (and) '(Becoming the Brahman) he merges into the Brahman'.[2] Also, there is no nature of Arthavāda in this (Śruti)[3] in the same way as in the Śruti statement regarding the reward of the use of a ladle (made of Palāśa wood).[4] [83]

[1]*Muṇḍakopaniṣad* 2.2.9.

[2]BU 4.4.6: *brahmaiva san brahmāpyeti.*

[3]SP controverts the variant reading...*vādataitasyāh* for *tasyāṁ*; NKL and AnSS editions agree in respect of the latter reading.

[4]This *phalaśruti* has a reference to some subordinate or secondary reward in a ritual. In respect of the Śruti regarding *brahmāpyaya* (cf. *brahmāpyeti* in the preceding verse), there is no notion of primary and secondary rewards, i.e. results.

Verses 84-95 *explain that the Mahāvākyas 'That you are.' etc. as authoritative just like any prohibitive statement even when they merely refer to certain things as they are and not to the things that are to be accomplished.*

निषिद्धानिष्टसंबन्धो वाक्यादेवावगम्यते ।।
न चानुष्ठेयता तस्य मनागप्युपपद्यते ।। ८४ ।।

Connection of what is prohibited and/or what is undesirable (with action) is understood only from a Śruti statement and its character as what is to be accomplished[1] cannot be proved by any reason, even to a little extent. [84]

[1]This is to emphasise that there can be authoritative Śruti statements even if they pertain to what is not to be accomplished (or) effected.

निषेधसंस्कृतधियो निषिद्धविषये न च ।।
पलाण्डादावकरणादन्या धीर्जायते श्रुतेः ।। ८५ ।।

And, indeed, in the case of one whose intellect[1] is impressed by a prohibitive rule in regard to what is prohibited, there does not arise from a Śruti statement any knowledge[1] other than that of not taking an onion etc.[2] [85]

[1]The first *dhī* stands for the sense-organ (*buddhi*) and the second for the impression on it (*jñānākāra*).

[2]Cf. *Manusmṛti* 5.19: *palāṇḍuṁ gṛñjanaṁ caiva laśunaṁ grāmakukkuṭam/chatrākaṁ viḍvarāhaṁ ca matyā jagdhvā paten naraḥ* (quoted in NKL); this is an example of a prohibitive sentence.

यथा निषेधवाक्येभ्यो नान्याकरणतो मतिः ।।
तत्त्वमस्यादिवाक्येभ्यस्तद्वदेवेति निश्चयः ।। ८६ ।।

[Verses 84-86 refer to the agreement between Vedānta-sentences and Brāhmaṇa-sentences as regards prohibitions.]

As from the prohibitive Śruti statements there does not arise any thought other than of not doing (certain things), so also from the sentences 'That you are.' etc. (there does not arise....doing)—this is the decision.[1] [86]

[1]Verse 85 stated the illustration and verse 86 explained its application to the Vedāntic sentences—and thus established the conclusion.

मृगतोये प्रवृत्तस्य तृडार्तस्योषरेक्षणात् ।।
तमोध्वस्तौ निवृत्तिः स्यात्तथात्मज्ञानतोऽपि नः ।। ८७ ।।

As in the case of one afflicted by thirst, who moves towards mirage (for drinking water), (there results only his turning back) when his ignorance (about it) is removed on his seeing the marshy land, so also (is removed), according to us, the turning back of one (from the false transmigratory world when one's ignorance is destroyed) by knowing the Ātman. [87]

तस्मान्निषेधशास्त्रस्य यथा भूतार्थनिष्ठता ।।
पुंव्यापारस्य गन्धोऽपि न तत्रास्तीति निश्चयः ।। ८८ ।।
आत्मयाथात्म्यविज्ञाननिष्ठता तद्वदीक्ष्यताम् ।।
तत्त्वमस्यादिवाक्यानां नानुष्ठानं मनागपि ।। ८९ ।।

Therefore, the decision is such that, as in the prohibitive scripture there is no reference to even a little of human activity, and that it is based on an existential entity, [88]

so, be it accepted (lit. seen) that in the case of sentences 'That you are.' etc. they pertain (only) to the knowledge of the true nature of the self and that there is no reference to any activity, even to a little extent. [89]

कलञ्जभक्षणस्येव ननु न श्रौतकर्मणः ।।
अज्ञानहेत्वनर्थार्थकारिता गम्यते मितेः ।। ९० ।।

(The objector answers:) 'But, as in the case of eating of *kalañja*,[1] it does not become known from the Śruti that the knowledge of a ritual activity, which is prescribed by scripture, has the nature of being the cause of ignorance and of some undesirable result.' [90]

This is an argument of the Mīmāṁsaka who holds that every sentence must have relation to some activity; it is not merely *ajñātajñāpaka*.

[1]It refers to poisoned meat.

नैवमज्ञानहेतुत्वानर्थार्थत्वेन तुल्यता ।।
कलञ्जभक्षणेनातस्तन्निवृत्तौ निवर्तते ।। ९१ ।।

(We answer:) 'There is no similarity[1] between (knowledge of the Brahman arising from the Śruti) and that about a *niṣiddha-karman*, like the eating of *kalañja*, in being the cause of ignorance and of some undesirable result[2]. (A person) desists (from every ritual activity) when his ignorance is removed (lit. warded off)[3].' [91]

This is the Siddhānta, an answer to the argument in the preceding verse.

[1]It literally means 'equality'.

[2]The eating of *kalañja* is owing to ignorance about its true nature and it brings about an untoward result, viz. death. So does the performance of a ritual activity proceed from ignorance about the nature of the self and brings about the continuation of the cycle of transmigration.

[3]*tannivṛtti* refers to *tamodhvasti* in connection with the knowledge of the Brahman, cf. verse 87 above.

शास्त्रमात्रनिमित्तत्वान्नित्यानां नैवमिष्यते ।।
मिथ्याज्ञानादिहेतुत्वं काम्यानामिव चेन्मतम् ।। ९२ ।।
नाविद्यारागद्वेषादिदोषदुष्टस्य तद्विधेः ।।
स्वर्गादिकामिनो यद्वदग्निहोत्रविधिस्तथा ।। ९३ ।।

मोहकामादिदुष्टस्य नित्यं कर्म विधीयते ।।
न स्वतः काम्यनित्यत्वविवेकोऽस्तीह कर्मणः ।। ९४ ।।

If it is held: 'We do not accept such nature of being the cause of false knowledge (about the self) etc. in the case of obligatory (rites) known only from the Śruti, as in the case of desired rites.' [92]

(To this the answer is: 'This is not so), since the injunction regarding them[1] is affected by the fault of ignorance, hankering (for some reward), hatred etc., as, for example, there is an injunction (for the performance) of Agnihotra for one who is desirous of heaven etc.'[2] [93]

'(Even) an obligatory rite is enjoined on one who is affected by ignorance, desire etc. (And) here (in Veda) there is not held any essential[3] distinction between rites being desired and obligatory.'[4] [94]

[1]This is a reference to the obligatory rites.

[2]Desire for heaven etc. signifies the undesirable identification of the self with a body, its pleasure and its transmigration etc. This explains *yathā ca darśapaurṇamāsādikriyedaṁphalā...* (BUB p. 50)

[3]This literally means 'of their own'.

[4]This is to say: the nature of the fourfold injunction, viz. *utpattividhi*, *viniyogavidhi*, *prayogavidhi* and *adhikāravidhi*, remains the same in the case of both kinds of rites.

कर्तृस्थेन हि स्वर्गादिकामदोषेण काम्यता ।।
अतो नान्येन काम्यत्वं कर्मणः स्यात्कथंचन ।। ९५ ।।

'The desirable nature of a ritual activity is on account of the faults such as the desire for heaven etc. which abide in a performer[1] (and) there would not be (in any rite) the nature of what is desirable on account of anything else, in any way.'[2] [95]

[1]NKL observes here: *kāmaprayuktaṁ kāmyam, jīvanaprayuktaṁ nityam.*

[2]SP supports this by citing a line from Manu Smṛti: *yad yadd hi kurute jantus tat tat kāmasya ceṣṭitam* (2.4).

Verses 96-111 *explain the distinction between two types of persons, those eligible for knowledge and those for action.*

आविरिञ्चाद्विरक्तस्य तद्विविक्तात्मकामिनः ।।
मोक्षे पुंसोऽधिकारः स्यान्न कामापहृतात्मनः ।। ९६ ।।

(As against the above, only) that man is eligible for liberation who has turned averse to (the world) beginning with the creator (Viriñca) and who has a desire for (knowing) the Ātman[1] which is distinct from that (world); but not he whose mind[2] is carried away by desire. [96]

[1]This refers to the Supreme Self.
[2]This refers to the inner self, identical with a human body, this is the meaning of the (second) *ātman*.

पराचः कामानित्येवं कामानित्यपरं तथा ।।
योऽकाम इति तद्वच्च श्रुतिः कामनिषेधनी ।। ९७ ।।

There is a Śruti statement[1]: *parācaḥ kāmān*; so also another, viz. *kāmān* and likewise yet another: *yo'kāmaḥ* (all of) which are prohibitive of (entertaining) desires. [97]

[1]Refer to *Kaṭhopaniṣad* 3.2: *parācaḥ kāmān anuyanti bālās te mṛtyor yanti vitatasya pāśam*; *Muṇḍakopaniṣad* 3.2.2: *kāmān yaḥ kāmayate manyamānaḥ sa kāmabhir jāyate tatra tatra*; BU 4.4.6: *athākāmayamāno yo'kāmo niṣkāma āptakāma ātmakāmo na tasya prāṇā utkrāmanti*—this is *niśedhaśruti* (NKL).

अविद्याया न चोच्छित्तौ ज्ञानादन्यदपेक्ष्यते ।।
ज्ञानोत्पत्तौ न चैवान्यच्छमादिभ्यो ह्यपेक्ष्यते ।। ९८ ।।

And for securing the removal of ignorance nothing else than the knowledge of (the true nature of) the Ātman is expected and for securing the rise of (that) knowledge is expected nothing else than tranquillity etc. (which are the effects of purification (of one's mind) etc. [98]

शमाद्युत्पत्तये नान्यद्बुद्धिशुद्धेरपेक्ष्यते ।।
बुद्धिशुद्धौ च नित्यादिकर्मभ्यो नान्यदिष्यते ।। ९९ ।।

For achieving (lit. effecting) tranquillity etc. is expected nothing else than purification of intellect and for the purification of the intellect is desired nothing else than (the performance of) the obligatory and other rites. [99]

आत्माज्ञानैकहेतुत्वाद्वाङ्मनःकायकर्मणाम् ॥
आत्मज्ञानेन तद्बाधात्कर्मापेक्षा कुतो भवेत् ॥ १०० ॥

The activities of speech, *manas* and body which originate from (only) ignorance about the self that is (within) and gets stultified[1] by the knowledge of the self, whence can there be the expectation (i.e. need) of any ritual activity? [100]

[1]Or alternatively, 'which has its stultification...', that is to say: the effects of these performances are removed.

यदज्ञानात्प्रवृत्तिर्या तज्ज्ञानात्सा कुतो भवेत् ॥
प्रत्यग्ज्ञानोद्भवे तस्मात्समाप्तिः सर्वकर्मणाम् ॥ १०१ ॥

How can an activity (=*pravṛtti*) that (proceeds) from the ignorance about something continue after (the rise of) the knowledge of that (thing)? Therefore, on the rise of the knowledge of (the true nature of) the inner self, (there occurs) the cessation (lit. securing the end) of all activities.[1] [101]

[1]SP refers this to *Bhagavadgītā* 6.3: *yogārūḍhasya tasyaiva* (=*karmaṇaḥ*) *śamaḥ kāraṇam ucyate.*

न चोच्छिन्नात्ममोहस्य सदैवात्मधियः स्थितेः ॥
प्रतीच्यवसरोऽस्तीह वाङ्मनःकायकर्मणाम् ॥ १०२ ॥

And since in the case of him, whose ignorance about the Ātman is destroyed, there ever abides in his inner self the awareness of (the true nature of) the Ātman, there is no occasion for the activities of speech, *manas* and body. [102]

कर्मणोऽवसरश्चेत्स्यात्त्वद्भिक्षावसरो यथा ॥
नात्मवस्तुनिमित्तत्वात्सम्यग्बुद्धेः सदा स्थितेः ॥ १०३ ॥

If (the objector would say:), 'As there is an occasion for you to accept (going for) begging,[1] so there would be an occasion for activity (in the case of the knower of the Brahman).', (our reply is:) 'That is not so, since the right knowledge does ever remain[2], caused as it is by the Reality, viz. the Ātman[3]. [103]

[1]Begging is understood to be a duty of a Saṁnyāsin; cf. *Manusmṛti* 6.55 (note on verse 107 below).
[2]NKL states: *pravāharūpeṇeti śeṣaḥ* (at the end of the verse).
[3]This refers to the condition of *jīvanmukti*.

न वस्त्ववसरापेक्षं स्वतःसिद्धत्वकारणात् ।।
क्रियैवावसरापेक्षा तस्याः कारकतन्त्रतः ।। १०४ ।।

Reality does not expect (i.e. depend on) any occasion for its existence, since it has the nature of a self-established (thing). (Contrary to this) an effect[1] (lit. activity) expects an occasion, dependent as it is on some agent.[2] [104]

[1]Read SP: *kāryamātraṁ kriyāśabdena gṛhyate.*
[2]It could as well be thus: on some means of production, time for it etc. connected with the verb (*kāraka*).

सम्यग्ज्ञानशिखिप्लुष्टं कुतोऽज्ञानं पुनर्भवेत् ।।
शुद्धदोषोद्भवत्वाच्च न तु कर्मैवमिष्यते ।। १०५ ।।

How could the ignorance which is (once) burnt by the fire of right knowledge arise again? An activity, however, is not accepted (lit. desired) to be such (viz. of such nature[1]), since it has its origin in the faults (that affect) what is (essentially and originally) pure. [105]

[1]Namely, what would not arise again.

क्षुधादिदोषहेत्वेव त्वस्मद्भुज्यादि नो मतम् ।।
नियतानेकहेतुत्वान्नातो भुजिसमा क्रिया ।। १०६ ।।

[Here Sureśvara explains *śāstranimittakāldyapekṣatvāt*...(BUB p. 55)]

Our activity of eating etc. is, as we know, what merely

arises out of the faults, hunger etc. Therefore, here[1] there is no action of ours[2] which is similar to the common eating of food etc., because it has arisen from various causes, viz. specified (rules of conduct). [106]

Here is the amplification of the idea of verse 105 above. A Saṁnyāsin's eating is not for satisfying hunger. See note on verse 103 above.

[1]It means 'in the state of *jīvanmukti*'.

[2]i.e. performed by us.

दोषहेतावपि तथा कालादिनियमस्तथा ॥
भवद्भिक्षाटनादौ स्यादिति चेन्नैतदेव तु ॥ १०७ ॥

If (it is still argued:) 'Even in the case of (an act which is) effected by faults, there are rules regarding time etc., so they are there in your going abegging etc.'[1], (our reply is:) 'It is indeed not just this.' [107]

[1]That is to say: Such rules as *cāturvarṇyaṁ cared bhaikṣyam* (untraceable); *ekakālaṁ cared bhaikṣyam* (*Manusmṛti* 6.55); *yatīnāṁ tu caturguṇam* (*Śaṅkhasmṛti* 16. 24; *Viṣṇusmṛti* 60.26 and *Manusmṛti* 5.137 which uses *ca* instead of *tu*).

नैवायं नियमोऽस्माकं परिसंख्या हि सा यतः ॥
क्रियाप्रयोक्त्री नाप्येषा तस्माद्विषममुच्यते ॥ १०८ ॥

'Indeed, this is not our rule; because it is, according to us,[1] a rule of exclusion.[2] And this rule (of exclusion) is not promotive of any activity.[3] Therefore, what you have said is only an indication of disagreement (between the two activities under reference).[4]' [108]

[1]It literally means 'for us'.

[2]*parisaṁkhyā* is a rule which is thus defined: (*vidhir atyantam aprāptau niyamaḥ pakṣīke sati,*) *tatra cānyatra ca prāptau parisaṁkhyeti gīyate* (*Ślokavārtika*).

[3]Sureśvara points out that what seem as rules regarding the time etc. for a Saṁnyāsin's going abegging do not promote his activity but they intend to exclude any other point of time for him, if at all he intended go for it.

[4]The objector's comparison of a ritual activity with a Saṁnyāsin's going abegging is only inapt. The two are totally dissimilar.

नातोऽपवादकृत्सा स्यादैकात्म्यज्ञानजन्मनः ॥
सर्वकर्माधिकाराणां निषेधायात्मधीभवः ॥ १०९ ॥
निषेधविधिवत्तस्मात्प्रत्यग्याथात्म्यधीविधिः ॥
प्रत्यङ्मोहैकहेतुत्वाद्वाङ्मनःकायकर्मणाम् ॥ ११० ॥

'Therefore, it (viz. *parisaṁkhyā*) does not cause any fault, since there is the rise of the knowledge of the uniqueness of the self. (Indeed) the rise of the knowledge of the Ātman results into (lit. is for) the removal (lit. annihilation) of all the sources of eligibility for (ritual) activity.' [109]
'Therefore, the (so-called) injunction in respect of (acquiring) the knowledge of the true nature of the inner self is like the prohibitive rule, because (all) activities of speech, *manas* and body have only ignorance about the inner self as their cause.' [110]

These two verses point to the similarity of between *pratyagyāthātmya-vidhi* (which is granted to be a *parisaṁkhyā-vidhi*) and *niṣedha-vidhi* and yet emphasise the real nature of the so-called *parisaṁkhyā-vidhi*.

तस्माद्वस्त्वेकनिष्ठस्य प्रामाण्यं वचसो ध्रुवम् ॥
प्रतिषेधविधेर्यद्वदुभयोरविशेषतः ॥ १११ ॥

Therefore, the authoritativeness of the statement (of the Śruti) resting only on the Reality is positively certain, exactly in the same way as of a prohibitive rule, since there is no difference between them. [111]

Sureśvara summarizes the argument given so far: The prohibitive rule causes the rise of knowledge of what one should not do and does not promote (i.e. enjoin) any activity. Similarly, a rule regarding obtaining the knowledge of the self only gives rise to the knowledge and does not promote any activity.

स्वाभाविकैकदोषोत्थो व्यवहार इहासुरः ।।
शास्त्रैकहेतुर्देवः स्यात्तयोः स्पर्धा विरोधतः ।। ११२ ।।

[The meaning of BU 1.3.2 beginning with *te ha vācam* is taken up, by referring to the myth of the fight between the gods and the demons who represent different tendencies of the twofold doings of individuals.]

In this (legend), the demoniac activity has arisen from the faults which are related only to their nature and that connected with the gods would have only the scripture as its basis.[1] Thus, the rivalry of the two[2] occurred on account of the conflict (of their natures). [112]

[1]The notion of gods and their favour of gifts etc. becomes known only from the scriptural texts.

[2]This is a reference to the gods and the demons, mentioned in the myth.

The story of the rivalry between the gods and the demons, given in BU and CU, is supported by the division of qualities as *daiva* and *āsura* in the *Bhagavadgītā*, i.e. the *Mahābhārata*.

प्राकृतासङ्गविज्ञानकार्ये ह्यधिकृतिः स्वतः ।।
सुरद्विषां सुराणां तु शास्त्रोत्थज्ञानदीपितः ।।
कर्मज्ञानाधिकारः स्यात्संग्रामस्तद्विरोधतः ।। ११३ ।।

Indeed the haters of the gods have by their very nature an inclination (lit. eligibility) towards activity which is the effect of (such) knowledge (as is) rooted in natural attachment.[1] Contrary to this, the gods' inclination towards activity and knowledge is revealed (lit. illuminated) by knowledge arising from the Śāstra.[2] Therefore, there ensues[3] a conflict (between the gods and the demons) from the conflict between the same.[4] [113]

[1]This means 'the innate ignorance of an individual about the true nature of the inner self'.

[2]The scriptural texts give rise to such knowledge and activity as is (in almost every case) opposed to natural tendencies of an individual.

[3]The word *syāt* '(lit.) would be' is freely translated thus.
[4]That is, natural tendency and Śāstric impulse.

उत्कर्षो मानुषादूर्ध्वं पुंसः केवलधर्मतः ।।
अधोभावस्त्वधर्मात्स्याद्द्वाभ्यां मानुष्यसंभवः ।। ११४ ।।

The ascendance of a man above the status of a human being is[1] on account of only *dharma*,[2] but his descendance from that (status) is on account of *adharma*.[3] On account of both of these, there is (in store for one) the status of a human being. [114]

[1]It literally means 'would be'.
[2]It refers to 'the performance of duties according to the scriptural prescriptions (Śāstra)'.
[3]It refers not to 'the absence of the performance of prescribed duties' but to 'doing what is opposed to *dharma*'.

आग्रजस्थाणुपर्यन्तशरीरग्रहणान्यतः ।।
लोकेष्विति श्रुतिर्वक्ति विरोधस्तन्निबन्धनः ।। ११५ ।।

Therefore, the Śruti declares, '(There occurs) assuming of (different) bodies beginning from that which was born first[1] and ending with a pillar (lit. an immovable). The conflict[2] is then based on that[3].'. [115]

[1]This refers to Prajāpati Hiraṇyagarbha who was the first embodied being and sacrificer.
[2]The words 'of the gods and the demons' are to be supplied.
[3]It means 'variously assuming bodies'.

अधोलोकफलेष्वेव प्राकृतज्ञानकर्मसु ।।
यत्नादासञ्जनीयोऽयं पितेत्यसुरनिश्चयः ।। ११६ ।।
प्राकृतासङ्गतो मुक्त्वा पितायं दैवसाधनैः ।।
उत्कृष्टव्यो यथाशक्ति विबुधानां चिकीर्षितम् ।। ११७ ।।

The decision of the demons was this: 'Let us with an effort get our father[1] attached to the activity and knowledge which arise from his very nature and which have the lower world(s)[2] for their result.' [116]
What the gods wished to do was, 'Having freed[3] this our

father from his natural attachment, let us, to the best of our ability, have him raised[4] (above the low levels) by divine means[5] (of activity and knowledge).' [117]

[1]That is, Prajāpati.
[2]*prākṛtasaṅgavijñānakārye* of verse 113 above.
[3]*muktvā* is for *mocayitvā*—the casual sign is suppressed.
[4]*utkṛṣṭavya* is for *utkarṣṭavya*.
[5]That is, Śastric activity and knowledge.

नरप्रजापतितनावेवं देवासुरा मिथः ॥
स्वस्वभावानुरोधेन तेऽस्पर्धन्त स्ववृत्तिभिः ॥ ११८ ॥

[This confirms what is explained in verses 116-117.]

Thus, the gods and the demons in the body of the human[1] sacrificer rivalled with one another, following their own inclinations. [118]

[1]This refers to the status of the Brahman, viz. Prajāpati, the subtlest human form, which was the first manifest form of the Brahman.

यदोद्भवति शास्त्रोत्था दैवी वृत्तिस्तदासुरी ॥
व्येति यस्मात्ततोऽशेषं देवानां स जयः स्मृतः ॥ ११९ ॥
आसुरी तु यदा सेना कामक्रोधपुरःसरा ॥
जायते ह्यजयस्तेषामसुराणां जयस्तु सः ॥ १२० ॥

Since, when the divine inclination[1] that arises from (learning and following) scriptures prevails,[2] the demoniac (inclination[1]) disappears entirely;[3] therefore that is known to be the victory of the gods. [119]
As against this,[4] when the demoniac army, led by desire and anger, appears, there follows the defeat of them (=the gods). And[5] that is the victory of the demons. [120]

[1]Or alternatively, 'activity'.
[2]It literally means 'appears'.
[3]Or alternatively, 'in its entirety'.
[4]This *tu* refers to 'contrary to the statement above'.
[5]This *tu* means *ca*.

स्वाभाविकत्वादासुर्या भूयस्या सेनयार्दिताः ।।
न शर्म लेभिरे देवाः स्वात्मत्राणासमीक्षणात् ।। १२१ ।।

Afflicted by the army of the demons, which was very large on account of its being prompted (i.e. produced) by (their) nature,[1] the gods, not finding (lit. seeing) any protection for themselves,[2] did not find peace. [121]

[1]That is, natural inclination. Cf. verses 22 and 25 above.
[2]In other words, as they could not find a way to protect themselves.

स्वभूमेश्चाव्यमानानां सुराणामसुरैस्तदा ।।
प्रादुरासीन्मतिः साध्वी दैतेयभयनाशिनी ।। १२२ ।।

[Here is stated the purpose of BU 1.3.2: *te ha...udgītheti.*]

Then[1] there arose a good thought (in the mind) of gods who were being shaken from their own state by the demons—(a thought which, they felt or considered) could ward off the fear of the sons of Diti (=demons). [122]

[1]Or alternatively, 'At that juncture'.

उद्गीथं समुपाश्रित्य ज्योतिष्टोमक्रताविह ।।
तिरस्कृत्यासुरं दैवं भावं यामोऽधुना वयम् ।। १२३ ।।

'Having resorted to Udgītha[1] in this Jyotiṣṭoma sacrifice and having (suppressed) the demoniac nature, let us now attain[2] (our) divine nature[3].' [123]

[1]This refers to the deity of the Udgītha—SP, note of the editor of NKL.
[2]The Present Indicative *yāmaḥ* is used for Present Imperative.
[3]The word *bhāva* can be connected with the demoniac and/or the divine.

कर्तृत्वादीह यत्सिद्धं वागादिद्वारमीक्ष्यते ।।
आत्मनस्तदविद्योत्थं निरविद्ये निषेधतः ।। १२४ ।।
लौकिको वैदिकः सर्वो व्यवहारश्च वक्ष्यते ।।
अन्नत्रयाधिकारे हि मनआदावनात्मनि ।। १२५ ।।
भूतेहानुविधायित्वात्क्षेत्रज्ञस्य तमस्विनः ।।
कूटस्थात्मातिरेकेण रूपमन्यन्न लक्ष्यते ।। १२६ ।।

[Verses 124-26 explain that the daily dealings exist in Speech and others.]

Whatever is known here in an individual[1] as the capacity for activity etc. (and) is noticed to have come to exist (lit. got established) through Speech and others, has (really) arisen from ignorance (about the true nature of it[2]) —for,[3] there is a denial (in the Śruti) of (the existence of that) in one who is free from ignorance.[4] [124]

And (every) dealing,[5] (be it) worldly or Vedic, will be declared in the section referring to three foods[6] (to be resting) on *manas* etc.[7] (which are) the non-Ātmans. [125]

A form of the knower of the field who is overpowered by darkness[8] (viz. ignorance) on account of its following (lit. imitating) the activities[9] of the elements is seen as apart from the immutable Ātman; (in reality) no other form (i.e. distinct from it[10]) is noticed. [126]

[1]The words *iha ātmanaḥ* refer to the inner self of an individual being.

[2]It means 'the inner self'.

[3]Or alternatively, 'the reason for saying so is that...'

[4]Cf. *yatra vā asya sarvam ātmaivābhūt tat kena...tat kena kam paśyet*...(BU 2.4.14)

[5]Cf. BSB (*adhyāsabhāṣya*): *tam etam avidyākhyam ātmānātmanor itaretarādhyāsam puraskṛtya sarve pramāṇaprameyavyavahārā laukikā vaidikāś ca pravṛttāḥ...*/ (p. 40)

[6]TU 2.8.

[7]Speech and Prāṇa are meant (SP).

[8]The Ātman is referred to in verse 124 as qualified by the word *niravidya* and here by *kṣetrajña* and *tamasvin*.

[9]The word *bhūteha* generally stands for *bhūta-icchā*, but Sureśvara uses it in the sense of 'activity' (= *bhūta-ceṣṭā*); cf. the note of the editor of NKL.

[10]Or alternatively, 'the other, viz. real, (form of the Ātman as such) is not noticed'.

Verses 127-153 *explain BU* 1.3.2.

एवं ताः संप्रधार्योचुरुद्गीथं साधनं परम् ।।
तत्परीक्षां प्रयत्नेन चक्रुः संभूय देवताः ।। १२७ ।।

Having thus thought, those deities, coming together, said, the 'Udgītha (is) the best means' and then they tested it[1] with care.[2] [127]

[1]It means 'wished to ascertain the potence/usefulness of it'.

[2]SP explains *prayatna* as an *anvayavyatirekākhya-vyāpāra.* Possibly it meant: The gods feel that, not resorting to the Udgīthadevatā, they have lost (i.e. not succeeded) in the strife with the demons—this is Vyatireka. Now they would like to find if resorting to the same would bring them success—this is Anvaya.

वाचं संभावयामासुरियं ह्युद्गीथकर्मणि ।।
अत्यर्थं व्यापृता दृष्टा वाचमूचुस्ततः सुराः ।। १२८ ।।
त्वं न उद्गाय उद्गानं त्वत्प्रधानं भवत्विदम् ।।
उद्गीथ इति चोद्गानं कर्मैवेहाभिधीयते ।। १२९ ।।

They thought (about) the Speech (thus): "Indeed, this one is seen to be the most active[1] in the ritual connected with the Udgītha."[2] (And) those gods then addressed the Speech: [128]
Do you sing aloud for us.[3] May this singing aloud have you (as) the prominent (singer). Here the activity of singing aloud is mentioned by the word *udgītha.*[4] [129]

[1]*vyāpṛta=vyāpṛtavatī*, i.e. *vyāpāravatī.*

[2]This refers to one of the divisions of a Sāman (=*sāmabhaktiviśeṣa*); cf Introduction.

[3]Note the absence of Saṁdhi in *udgāya udgānaṁ*—an archaic tendency in Sureśvara.

[4]This refers to the *sāmabhaktiviśeṣa.* This is according to the view of the objector.

स्तोत्रेणास्याभिसंबन्धाद्भक्तिमात्रं न तु क्वचित् ।।
वागभिगानिनी चेह वाक्शब्देनाग्निरुच्यते ।। १३० ।।

On account of the close connection of this one with the (entire) prayer,[1] (we must understand that) this (word) does not refer merely to a part (of the Sāman) anywhere (in this context) and further by the word *vāc* is mentioned Agni, the superintending deity of speech.[2] [130]

This is the Siddhānta; an answer to the objector's view in the preceding verse. Accordingly, the Udgītha refers to the activity of the Udgātṛ priest.

[1]This is a reference to the Pavamāna Stotra in the Agniṣṭoma. Cf. *athātaḥ pavamānānām...sa yatra prastuyāt tad etāni japet* (*Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 14.4.1.30; BU 1.3.28). Also, since the prayer contains a request, the addressee must be a sentient being who is capable of granting the request.

[2]Cf. *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* 1.2.4: *agnir vāg bhūtvā mukham prāviśat...*

विषयोऽध्येषणाया हि चेतनावान्यतो मतः ॥
उपासिक्रियया योगो देवताया इहेष्यते ॥ १३१ ॥

Because it is indeed one, who is possessed of Sentience, can be the object of some impulse; therefore, here[1] is required the connection of a deity with the act expressed by the verbal root *upa√ās*. [131]

This verse is an address to those who consider the deities such as Speech, Eye and others as non-sentient.

[1]Namely, in this context, i.e. in respect of the section on *upāsti* 'worship'.

अतोऽपि देवतैवेह वाक्शब्देनाभिधीयते ॥
तद्भूतेः पुरुषार्थत्वाद्देवता हीश्वरा परा ॥ १३२ ॥

For this reason also, here it is only the deity that is expressed by the word *vāc*. Since becoming[1] that (deity in the end) is the goal (or reward) of human activity,[2] the deity here[3] is the highest ruler. [132]

[1]*bhūti=bhāva* 'becoming'.

[2]The words 'which is connected with the Udgītha' are to be supplied.

[3]It means 'in this Upaniṣad, Agni is the highest'—cf note 2 on verse 130 above.

सैवातः प्रतिपत्तव्या सर्वासु ध्यानभूमिषु ॥
न त्विह प्रतिपत्तव्याः करणस्थानगोचराः ॥ १३३ ॥

Only that (deity) has therefore to be understood (lit. accepted) in all the phases of the meditations; and not (those deities) which have various organs of activities as the objects (of their superintending)[1];

[1]The deity of any particular meditation—here Agni. [133]

पाराथ्यचितनत्वाभ्यां मर्त्यत्वाच्चापि कारणात् ।। १३४ ।।

since they serve the purpose of another and have insentience as their nature, and also for the reason of their mortality. [134]

एवं वागादयः शब्दा देवतार्थाभिधायिनः ।।
सर्वत्र प्रतिपत्तव्या यत्रोपासा विवक्षिता ।। १३५ ।।

Thus, the words Speech and others are to be understood as expressive of the meaning, the deities, wherever it is intended to state about meditation. [135]

जपमन्त्राभिधेयेयं वागित्येवं विनिश्चिताः ।।
उपासांचक्रिरे देवा एषैवोद्गीथदेवता ।। १३६ ।।

Those gods who had thus decided that this deity (of) speech, addressed (lit. expressed) in the Japamantra,[1] worshipped (it), and, also (they decided) 'This is the deity of the Udgītha.' [136]

[1]This is: *asato mā sad gamaya...*; the Abhyārohajapa.

देवाभ्युदय उद्गानं देवेभ्योऽर्थाय वागियम् ।।
यथाशक्त्युदगायत्तं यो भोगो वाङ्निबन्धनः ।। १३७ ।।

[Here is the purpose of BU 1.3.2: *tatheti tebhyo...vadati tadātmane.*]

(Then) this Speech sang aloud, with whatever was her might, the Udgītha[1] for securing the rise of the gods,[2] (yes,) for (securing) the purpose of the gods—that (enjoyment) which was the enjoyment resting in Speech.[3] [137]

[1]The *udgāna* is for Udgītha, referring to the *sāmabhaktiviśeṣa*.

[2]This use of the locative is for expressing the purpose.

[3]That is to say: which would arise from the employment of Speech; this explains *yo vāci...*

येन भोगेन वाग्देवांश्चक्षुरादीनहर्निशम् ।।
साक्षादवति तं भोगमुदगायदशेषतः ।। १३८ ।।

With what enjoyment, Speech directly favours the deities Eye etc. day and night, that enjoyment it sang aloud in its fullness. [138]

पवमानेषु सोद्गात्री याजमानं यथाविधि ।।
फलमुद्गाय शेषेषु ह्युदगायदथात्मने ।। १३९ ।।

Speech, being the Udgātṛ (priest), and having sung the (Sāman-)song for (securing) the end of the sacrificer,[1] in the Pavamāna Stotras, according to the procedure, (towards securing) the reward,[2] sang in the remaining (chants) (for a reward) for itself.[3] [139]

[1]Namely, the gods.

[2]That is to say: having sung to the effect that the reward was secured.

[3]Among the twelve Stotras that are sung in the Agniṣṭoma, there are three Pavamāna Stotras which produce a reward for the sacrificer. The nine others are the Udgātṛ Stotras: The singing of these Stotras secures a reward for the Udgātṛ. Here Speech is the Udgātṛ, and therefore it brings a reward for itself.

स्तोत्रेषु परिशिष्टेषु वागागायदथात्मने ।।
यत्कल्याणं वदत्येषा ह्यात्मने तदचीक्लपत् ।। १४० ।।

[The word *śeṣeṣu* in the preceding verse is explained here.]

Then Speech sang in the remaining Stotras (a reward) for itself, viz. whatever auspicious (*kalyāṇa*) it speaks (in these nine Stotras), it secures (the same) just[1] for itself. [140]

[1]The purpose of the word 'just' (*hi*) is explained by SP thus: *uktakāryasya karaṇāntareṣu asambhavaprasiddhyartho hiśabdaḥ.*

यथाशास्त्रं यथायोगं वर्णदोषविवर्जितम् ॥
वर्णोच्चारणसामर्थ्यं ममैवास्तु तदीदृशम् ॥ १४१ ॥

It is thus: 'May I indeed have the capacity of pronouncing different letters, thus: It should be in accordance with the science (of rituals) and in accordance with (the science of language[1]), i.e. in language free from faults in respect of letters.' [141]

[1]This refers to the science of etymology.

कल्याणवदनोत्थं यत्कृत्स्नं देवेभ्य एव तत् ॥
फलं वदनमात्रं तु वाच एव न दैविकम् ॥ १४२ ॥

Whatever reward arises from the utterance of (the) auspicious is all of it for the sake of gods, but (that which arises) only from the pronunciation is for Speech is not (intended) for the deity. [142]

तमस्युत्सार्यमाणे तु वाचोद्गात्रा सुरद्विषाम् ॥
स्वाधिकाराच्च्याव्यमानास्ते विदुर्देवहृद्गतम् ॥ १४३ ॥

[*te viduḥ* (BU 1.3.2) is explained.]

And when the darkness (in the form) of the haters of the gods[1] was (thus) being dispelled by Speech, the Udgātṛ, they, being thrown away from their own position (of superiority)[2], understood what had passed (i.e. the thought) in the mind (lit. heart) of the gods. [143]

[1]*suradviṣām tamaḥ* is explained fully in the next verse.

[2]The gods became strong by the purity of speech etc. (=*śāstra-vihitakarman*) and, therefore, the natural tendency of the sacrificer for securing worldly pleasure became weaker and weaker. This was the beginning of the defeat of the demons, who were described in verse 22 above as *jyāyāṁsaḥ*.

अनेन वाचोद्गात्रा नो बलं ध्वान्तं तु देवताः ॥
ज्योतिषा स्वेन निर्जित्य यास्यन्त्यग्न्यादिरूपताम् ॥ १४४ ॥

(Thus did they understand:) 'These gods will have won by their own lustre[1] our strength[2], this darkness, through, (the

help of) this Speech, the Udgātṛ, and will attain the forms[3] of the deities Agni and so on.' [144]

[1]This symbolises their knowledge of the rituals etc. from Śāstric works.

[2]Or alternatively, 'army', by way of pun.

[3]That is to say: Their true nature as deities. Or, excellence; cf. *svaṁ vapuḥ* (mentioned in verse 146 below).

महन्नो भयमायातमिति बुबुधिरेऽसुराः ॥
कर्मण्यनुचिते तेषां प्रहीणमनसां तदा ॥
वदनादावभिष्वङ्गः आत्मसंभावनादभूत् ॥ १४५ ॥

The demons knew that a (matter of) great fear had come to them. Then they, of minds given to bad inclinations, came to have addiction to the improper deed, speaking etc.,[1] out of their pride for themselves. [145]

[1]This means 'speaking bad words, and so on'. This is in opposition to *kalyāṇavadana* of Vāc mentioned in verse 140 above.

यत्कल्याणमिति च्छिद्राद्विदुः सुरचिकीर्षितम् ॥
अनेन वै न उद्गात्रा वाचात्येष्यन्ति स्वं वपुः ॥ १४६ ॥

(Indeed) they[1] understood from the loop-hole,[2] expressed in their[3] words, 'whatever is auspicious...' (BU 1.3.2)[4] what the gods wished to do. (Thus:) 'Indeed they[5] will attain through Speech, the Udgātṛ, their own form, despite us[6].' [146]

[1]It means 'the demons'.

[2]The word *chidra* is 'short coming' (according to Roer) and it is 'some spot through which you understand'; cf. NKL: *chidrāt kalyāṇavadanāsaṅgarūpād ity arthaḥ*.

[3]That is, of the gods.

[4]*yat kalyāṇām...vadati tad ātmane.*

[5]That is, the gods.

[6]We construe thus: *eṣyanti svaṁ vapuḥ naḥ ati* where *ati* is a *karmapravacanīya* which governs the accusative form *naḥ*.

इति ज्ञात्वा ह्यभिद्रुत्य स्वैरासङ्गशरोर्मिभिः ॥
विविघुस्तानथोद्गातृंस्ते विद्धास्तत्यजुः क्रियाः ॥ १४७ ॥

[*tam abhidrutya*...(BU 1.3.2) is explained.]

Indeed, having known thus, they attacked (the gods) by means of the surging waves of their arrows (made up of) attachment (to worldly pleasures), first pierced them (the gods) and then the Udgātṛs.[1] (Subsequently) they,[2] (thus) pierced, gave up their ritual activity. [147]

The intention of this verse is to emphasise the conflict between the natural tendencies of a human being and the knowledge acquired from Śruti—and not what really happened. Therefore, reference to the giving up of ritual activity of the Udgītha refers merely to the activity of the sense-organs. This means Prāṇa 'vital force' remains, in reality, unaffected, i.e. it alone can resist and overcome the natural tendencies.

[1]They are the priests chanting the Udgītha.
[2]It refers to the gods.

नानादन्यस्य सामर्थ्यं विद्यतेऽसुरनाशने ।। १४८ ।।
अनेनाप्रतिरूपेण वचसा कार्यशायिना ।।
पाप्मादिदोषसंपर्कः कारणस्थोऽनुमीयते ।। १४९ ।।

(Indeed) none else than Prāṇa[1] has the capacity for destroying the demons. [148]
The association with faults, viz. sin etc., that abides in the cause,[2] is inferred by the matchless Prāṇa from this speech which is noticed as extending into (lit. lying in) the effect. [149]

This reference to the activities of the sense-organs is only indicative of the basic ignorance, sin etc. on the part of an individual who does non-scriptural activities.

[1]*ana*=Prāṇa.
[2]This stands for the different sense-organs which performed various activities that are their *kārya*.

व्युत्थायाख्यायिकारूपाच्छ्रुतिः स्ववपुषाधुना ।।
आचष्टे कारणे वृत्तं कार्यगेणासुरात्मना ।। १५० ।।

[*sa yaḥ sa pāpmā...sa eva sa pāpmā* (BU 1.3.2) is explained.]

Having risen above (i.e. given up) this form of the narrative, the Śruti itself[1] now informs about the behaviour in the cause, (viz. the sense-organs), (inferring it) from the effect which is the demoniac nature. [150]

[1]That is, in the form its own statements.

दृष्टेनाप्रतिरूपेण कार्यगेणानुमीयते ।।
कारणे पाप्मवेधोऽभूद्यो वाचि प्राक्प्रजापतेः ।। १५१ ।।

The affliction (lit. piercing) caused by sin which earlier (or formerly) occurred in the case of the cause, viz. the speech of Prajāpati, is inferred from what is seen as a singular (characteristic) in the effect.[1] [151]

[1]This is to state the result of usual inference. In fact, the Brahman (or Prāṇa), which is the cause, is never affected by any fault. Cf. CU 8.12.1: *na vai saśarīrasya sataḥ priyāpriyayor apahatir asti*; *apāpaviddham....(Īśopaniṣad* 8); *na ha vai devān...* (BU 1.5.20) (SP).

स यो वाच्यसुरैः क्षिप्तः पाप्मा कार्ये स दृश्यते ।।
प्रमाविरोधि यद्वाक्यं तत्तत्कार्यसमाश्रयम् ।। १५२ ।।

That sin which the demons had put into Speech is seen in the effect. Whatever statement is opposed to the right knowledge (about the true nature of the Ātman) is all related to the effect (viz. ignorance).[1] [152]

[1]The second line of this verse explains: *sa yaḥ sa pāpmā....* (BU 1.3.2). This means, ill or false speaking is noticeable in the descendents of Prajāpati.

स एव स इति ह्युक्तिः कार्यकारणसंस्थयोः ।।
प्रजासु साक्षाद्यः पाप्मा यश्च तत्कारणाश्रयः ।। १५३ ।।

[Verses 154-163 convey the purpose of BU 1.3.3-6.]

For the statement in the Śruti *sa eva saḥ* is related to the two states of the cause and the effect, namely that whatever sin is actually seen in offsprings and that which has a basis in its cause. [153]

घ्राणं चक्षुस्तथा श्रोत्रं मनश्चैवमनुक्रमात् ।।
वव्रुर्देवा यथा वाणीं विद्धाः सर्वे तथासुरैः ।। १५४ ।।

All the gods (then) chose the sense of smell,[1] the sense of sight, the sense of hearing and *manas*, one after another, as they (first) chose Speech when they were pierced by the demons; (they chose these others) in the order (mentioned in the verse). [154]

[1]The NKL edition reads *prāṇam* in the place of *ghrāṇam*! NKL also cites *prāṇam iti* as the *pratīka* of the Mantra, but does not comment on the same!! Possibly this is a reference to the principal among five breaths.

कर्मेन्द्रियाणां सर्वेषां वागेवात्रोपलक्षणम् ।।
चक्षुःश्रोत्रे धीन्द्रियाणां मनो बुद्धेस्तथैव च ।। १५५ ।।

In this,[1] only Speech is indicative of all the organs of activity. Eyes and ears (are indicative) of the sense-organs and likewise *manas* (is indicative) of the intellect.[2] [155]

[1]Context of the narrative of the gods and the demons: the sin which affects divine nature of the deities superintending over the sense-organs.

[2]SP accepts from *buddhi* the implication of *citta* and *ahaṁkāra* also, but NKL does not. It is difficult to say if *citta* is meant by Śaṅkara.

कृत्स्नं जगदनादाय नैकस्यापीष्यते क्रिया ।।
प्राणस्य किमु वक्तव्यं कृत्स्नाध्यात्मेन्द्रियग्रहः ।। १५६ ।।

They do not accept even in the case of a single (organ) any activity without having (lit. taking up or making use of) all of (this) world.[1] What then can be said about Prāṇa? There is (on the part of it) the use of the entire (group of) the organs abiding in the body. [156]

[1]SP refers to *iyam pṛthivī sarveṣām bhūtātām madhu* in BU 2.5.1 and adds *iti śrutau sarvasya sarvatra kāraṇatāyā vakṣyamāṇatvāt.*

यद्यपीदं जगत्कृत्स्नं गृह्यते संहतत्वतः ।।
तथापि चोदितोऽत्रार्थ उपास्यो नागतोऽर्थतः ।। १५७ ।।

Even if this entire world is taken up (for use) owing to its being one collected (mass)[1], yet here (i.e. in this context) only that object which is put forth in the Śruti[2] is (alone) to be worshipped and not the one which is understood by implication.[3] [157]

[1]This has a basis in a possible doubt originating in the need of the entire world for any activity (as said in the preceding verse).

[2]This refers to *vāgādi* as the objects of worship.

[3]Both SP and NKL point to the rule of interpretation: *yaś cārthād artho na sa codayitavyaḥ*.

कल्याणतररूपेण परिशिष्टेष्वपीक्ष्यते ।।
विभाग आसुरो वेधस्तेन तेष्वनुमीयते ।। १५८ ।।

In (the case of) the remaining (i.e. other, organs[1] also) is accepted (i.e. inferred) the demoniac part (or aspect)[2] obtaining in the form of what is other than auspicious; therefore, the piercing (by demoniac inclination) of them also is inferred. [158]

[1]That is, *tvac* etc. which are not mentioned in the Śruti.

[2]This has a reference to *daiva* and *āsura* categories among all objects of creation as in the case of Prajāpati's offsprings.

अतस्तदर्थमाहेयमेवम्विति पुनः श्रुतिः ।।
यथा वागादयो विद्धास्तद्वज्ज्ञेयास्त्वगादयः ।। १५९ ।।

Therefore, in order to convey that (happening), the Śruti once again stated (the words) *evam u* ... (BU 1.3.6). (That is to say:) as Speech and others were pierced, in the same way, the sense of touch and others (also) are to be understood (as pierced). [159]

सिद्धान्वागादिदृष्टान्तान्पुरस्कृत्यात उच्यते ।।
एवम्वित्युक्तशेषाणां पाप्मविद्धत्वसिद्धये ।। १६० ।।

Therefore, having brought forth the well-proven examples of Speech and others, the Śruti states *evam u* ... (the piercing by sin) (in the case) of the remaining (organs also), in order that their being affected by that sin is proved. [160]

अविध्यन्निति योऽर्थोऽस्य तव्याख्यानाय यत्यते ।।
स्वैः स्वैस्तानिन्द्रियासङ्गैः पाप्मभिस्त उपासृजन् ।। १६१ ।।

And now we make an effort to explain that, which is expressed by the verb *avidhyan*. (This is to say:) they (viz. the demons) attacked them (viz. the gods)[1] by their own attachments to the organs, their sins. [161]

[1]This refers to the gods which superintend over the sense of touch etc. Mark the masculine form *tān*.

यत्संसर्गं पुरा चक्रुरविध्यंस्तदिहोच्यते ।।
या विद्धा देवतास्तासां प्रक्रियासंहृतिः पृथक् ।। १६२ ।।

Since they first became attached to (the pleasures of the sense-organs), (therefore) it is stated here: *avidhyan* 'They pierced'; whichsoever of the deities were pierced had each a different (statement about) the happening and its end.[1] [162]

[1]Namely, being attached to pleasures in the case of them, first being pierced and later getting freed. This is stated with a view to pointing out the purposefulness of the Śruti statement, *evam u khalu devatāḥ*...

आसङ्गपाप्मभिर्विद्धा यस्माद्वागादयोऽसुरैः ।।
वर्जनीयास्ततस्ताः स्युर्नोपास्याः श्रेय ईप्सुभिः ।। १६३ ।।

Since Speech and others were pierced by the demons by means of the sins in the form of attachment, therefore, they are to be avoided; they are not to be worshipped by those who wish for bliss.[1] [163]

[1]It would look better if *śreyā ipsubhiḥ* is read as a compound word. AnSS edition and NKL edition however read two words; *śreyaḥ* and *īpsubhiḥ*—such (rare) use of this latter word as an unbound form is noticed in *Mahābhārata* 12.84.44: *tasmāt sarvair*

guṇair etair upapannāḥ supūjitāḥ/mantriṇaḥ prakṛtijñāḥ syus tryavarā mahad īpsavaḥ//; Nīlamata Purāṇa 493.760 (which belongs to a period between 500—1000 A.D.): *umāsampūjanaṁ kāryaṁ tasyāṁ saubhāgyam īpsunā.*

Verses 164-93 *explain BU* 1.3.7.

एवं निराशाः पूर्वासु देवतास्वसुरार्दनात् ।।
पारिशेष्यादथाजग्मुर्मध्यमं प्राणमादरात् ।। १६४ ।।

[*atha heman* is explained.]

Thus, feeling despair in respect of the previously mentioned (superintending) deities (of organs), on account of the afflictions inflicted by the demons, (the gods) then respectfully approached the individval self (=*madhyama prāṇa*)[1], as the remaining (i.e. last possible, resort). [164]

[1]Between the heavenly wind and the earthly wind, there is the middle one (viz. *madhyama*), called Prāṇa.

अथेत्यनन्तरोक्तिः स्यात्तथाभिनयवृत्तये ।।
इममित्यप्रसिद्धत्वात्प्राणस्येह त्वगादिवत् ।। १६५ ।।

The word *atha* is expressive of the sense 'then'; so also does the word *imam* (serve) the purpose of conveying the (symbolic) activity[1] (of them), because the Prāṇa is not (primarily or easily) known (in daily life) like the sense of touch and others.[2] [165]

[1]*abhinaya* is explained in SP as *vivakṣitārthadyotako dehatadavayavavyāpāraviśeṣaḥ* and in NKL as *saṁketavaśāt vivakṣitārthaprakāśakaḥ kāyāvayavavyāpāraḥ.*

[2]SP explains *iha* as *dehe*. Our translation 'in daily life' has the force of 'in the life of the embodied state'. The idea is: Prāṇa is not known to have one particular organ as its abode. Also, it is not *necessarily* known to be abiding in their ensemble.

अस्ति यस्मादसुर्नित्यमासन्योऽयमतो मतः ।।
वागादिभ्यो विभागार्थं विशेषणमसोरिदम् ।। १६६ ।।

Since Prāṇa is ever abiding (in the mouth), therefore it is known as this (viz. having the name) Āsanya and this (*āsanya*) is an adjective of the Prāṇa for making it from Speech and others. [166]

Prāṇa is the life principle and moves in the whole body.

जपमन्त्राभिधेयोऽत्र पारिशेष्यात्प्रतीयताम् ।।
उद्गीथदेवता प्राण इत्यभूत्सुरनिश्चयः ।। १६७ ।।
मन्त्रप्रयोगे सर्वेषां संनिधौ तत्प्रकाशितम् ।।

Finally, let it be known as the remaining possible conclusion that the decision of the gods was thus: 'Here,[1] Prāṇa is the deity of the Udgītha and (it is) addressed in the Japamantra.[2] [167]
That[3] is revealed in the employment of the Mantra[4] in the presence of all.[5] [168^{ab}]

[1]This is a reference to 'the ensemble of organs of sense and also other organs in the body and their activities.'

[2]See note 1 on verse 136 above; *abhidheyaḥ* 'one (to be) addressed'.

[3]This means 'the fact about Prāṇa as the deity of the Udgītha'.

[4]Namely, in the Japamantra *asato mā sad gamaya...*

[5]It appears to us probable that Sureśvara made verse 167 a verse of three lines—the third line is read in the printed editions as the first line of verse 168. For such a construction, cf. verse 145 above. This last line of the verse 167 then justifies the first word of the verse.

भारमुत्सहते वोढुं योऽनो यामस्तमाश्रयम् ।। १६८ ।।

We shall approach him, that Prāṇa, who can bear the burden (of protecting us)[1], (as) our resort. [168^{cd}]

[1]It is possible to read the second line of verse 168 as one full verse. For such a verse of one line, cf. verses 134 and 148 above.

परीक्षमाणास्ते त्राणं यथोक्ताख्यानवर्त्मना ।।
क्रमेणासेदुरासन्यं प्राणं पाप्मपराभवात् ।। १६९ ।।

Looking around[1] for protection (against defeat[2]) in their course (of search), as described in the course of the narrative, they found (lit. arrived at) Prāṇa that resides in the mouth, after overcoming the sin. [169]

[1]It is necessary to read the literal meaning of *pari-īkṣamāṇāḥ*.
[2]That is the defeat by the demoniac tendency, viz. sin etc.

श्रेयोर्थिनां मनुष्याणामुपास्यप्रतिपत्तये ॥
इयमाख्यायिका चक्षुर्नान्यथोपास्यनिश्चितिः ॥ १७० ॥

This narrative is an eye for men who wish for bliss, (that is to say:) in order that they understand (the real) object of the worship; the object of worship cannot (indeed) be decided otherwise.[1] [170]

[1]That is, to be other than Prāṇa.

यः प्राणे भोग इति न पूर्ववद्भण्यतेऽत्र किम् ॥
वागादीनामिव यतो नासोर्भोगो विशिष्यते ॥ १७१ ॥

(A question is asked:) 'Why is it not stated in the Śruti here *yaḥ prāṇe bhogaḥ*....as (it did) before?'.[1] (Our answer is:) 'Because the enjoyment of Prāṇa cannot be distinguished (from any other) as (that) of Speech and others (from any other enjoyment).'. [171]

[1]The argument proceeds from the notion of *prakaraṇabhaṅga*. This is to say: The Śruti does not state here *yaḥ prāṇe bhogaḥ taṁ devebhya āgāyat*....This is thus not in continuation of the tenor of the whole argument.

अकृत्स्नभोगतो युक्तं वागादिषु विशेषणम् ॥
सर्वस्यैवासुभोगत्वात्किं कुतोऽत्र विशिष्यते ॥ १७२ ॥

'(Such) distinguishing of enjoyment in the case of Speech and others is proper, since theirs is not full enjoyment.'. (To this the answer is:) Since all (enjoyment) is (but) the enjoyment by the Prāṇa, from what[1] (enjoyment) then can that be distinguished here?[2]'. [172]

This contains the answer which began in the second line of the preceding verse.

[1]The word *kutaḥ* can be alternatively translated as 'for what reason?'.

[2]SP supports this (last line) by verse 165 above: *aprasiddhatvāt ...tvagādivat.*

अभिसंधिरविव्यत्सन्नित्यभूत्सुरविद्विषाम् ।।
अनिष्ठितक्रियारम्भोऽविव्यत्सन्निति भण्यते ।। १७३ ।।

There arose in the mind of the haters of the gods a thought (lit. an intention) which was (finally) not going to pierce (them[1]). The word *avivyatsan* is used (to bring out the sense of) the beginning (or undertaking) of an activity which is not finally accomplished. [173]

[1]Namely, a thought which did not materialize; this is explained in the second half of the verse. The word 'them' refers to the gods.

विव्यत्सोद्देशमात्रण प्राणो हन्ता सुरद्विषाम् ।।
इत्यर्थप्रतिपत्त्यर्थमीदृग्दृष्टान्त उच्यते ।। १७४ ।।

On account of (the) mere desire to pierce (the gods),[1] Prāṇa is the destroyer of the haters of the gods. (Now), in order to convey this is given an illustration which is as follows: [174]

This explains the meaning of *saḥ* in *sa yathā....*(BU 1.3.7).

[1]The words 'which was entertained by the demons' are to be supplied.

बिभित्सायै यथा वेगाल्लोष्टः क्षिप्तोऽश्मनोऽन्तिकात् ।।
नश्येत्स्ववेगाच्छतधा ह्याखणाश्मसमागमात् ।। १७५ ।।
अप्रधृष्यं तथा प्राणमृत्वा नेशुः सहस्रधा ।।
दैत्यास्तन्नाशतो देवा देवा एवाभवन्सदा ।। १७६ ।।

[*yathāśmānam ṛtvā*...(BU 1.3.7) is explained.]

As a sod of clay is forcefully thrown with the desire of breaking[1] (a stone[2]), even from nearness to it, would (itself) get destroyed, by its own force, into a hundred (pieces), at the very contact with the unbreakable[3] stone. [175]

In the same way, (the demons) having attacked the invulnerable Prāṇa got destroyed into thousands (of pieces), then, on account of their destruction the gods could ever remain gods. [176]

[1]NKL reads *bibhitsayā* instead of *bibhitsāyai*.
[2]An unbreakable stone is meant.
[3]Read NKL: *na khanituṁ śakyate ṭaṅkādibhir iti akhaṇa eva ākhaṇaḥ*.

अत एव मनुष्यत्वहेतवोऽप्यसुराः समम् ॥
विनेशुर्विष्वग्गतयो लोष्टः क्षिप्तो यथाश्मनि ॥ १७७ ॥

For this very reason, the demons who are the cause of manhood,[1] fleeing into all directions, got at once destroyed, in the same way as a sod of clay (when) thrown on a stone. [177]

[1]This refers to any gross or subtle form of a human sacrificer, viz. any manifest form of Prajāpati.

प्राणस्वभावसंपत्तेः प्राणवद्देवता अपि ॥
देवा एवाभवन्दैत्यकृत्स्नपाप्मविनाशतः ॥ १७८ ॥

[*tato devāḥ abhavan* (BU 1.3.7) is explained.]

On attaining the nature of Prāṇa,[1] the deities also, like Prāṇa,[2] became gods[3] on account of the destruction of all the sins (inflicted on them) by the demons, [178]

[1]Read NKL: *asmād upāsanāt prāṇabhāvāt*.
[2]That is to say: as it retained its nature of a deity (by remaining unaffected by the demoniac sins).
[3]Read NKL: *cakṣurādayaḥ evaṁ cādityādibhāvaṁ gatā ity arthaḥ*.

वागादीन्द्रियसंघातो यजमानो यथा पुरा ।।
प्राणात्मभावाद्धत्वागो वैराजं रूपमाप्तवान् ।। १७९ ।।

[*bhavaty ātmanā* (BU 1.3.7) is explained.]

as formerly the sacrificer, who was a conglomeration of the organs, speech and others, obtained the form of (=became) Virāj after having struck down sin[1] by becoming possessed of the nature of the Prāṇa. [179]

This verse is a continuation of the sentence in the preceding verse.

[1]*āgaḥ=pāpam* (as paraphrased in the next verse).

तथा यस्तमुपासीत यथोक्ताख्यानवर्त्मना ।।
विराजैवात्मना हत्वा पापं भवति सोऽचिरात् ।। १८० ।।

[*tathā purā kalpena varṇitaḥ....*(BUB p. 63) is explained.]

In the same way, whosoever worships that (Prāṇa) in the manner stated in the narrative that is told soon becomes (identical with Prāṇa) after having struck down sin by having the nature (i.e. strength) of Virāj.[1] [180]

[1]Read SP: *virāḍātmanopāsako bhavati.*

जीवाविष्ट उपास्योऽत्र देवताविग्रहः सदा ।।
प्राणो हिरण्यगर्भात्मा यावत्तदभिमान(?)निता ।। १८१ ।।

In this context, what is to be worshipped is ever the body of a deity which is pervaded by Sentience, i.e. Prāṇa of the nature of Hiraṇyagarbha, so long as there remains (or exists) consciousness on its part of being that.[1] [181]

[1]We follow translations and the reading *abhimānitā* which the NKL edition has adopted and shown by the AnSS edition as a variant because that makes a better sense.

भावनोपचयाद्धत्वा परिच्छेदं स्वमासुरम् ।।
देवतात्मानमेत्याशु सदा तद्भावभावितः ।। १८२ ।।

Having (first) destroyed his own demoniac limitation by increase in devotion,[1] (that sacrificer) soon[2] attains the nature of the deity, ever full of thought of becoming that.[3] [182]

[1]*bhāvanā=bhakti* '(awareness) of being that'. SP invites attention to *Bhagavadgītā* 8.6: *yaṁ yaṁ vāpi smaran...taṁ tam evaiti kaunteya*. The Upaniṣad has this sense of *bhakti*: One becomes what one thinks about at the time of death; therefore, one thinks of becoming a deity at the time of death and becomes that.

[2]That is, within very short time.

[3]Or alternatively, 'ever devoted'.

तत्तमोमात्रविध्वंसान्नतु प्राणादिराप्यते ।।
कार्यत्वात्कारणं मुक्त्वा न हि तत्कार्यसंभवः ।। १८३ ।।
देवो भूत्वेह देवोऽसौ भावनोपचयाद्भवेत् ।।
पुंव्यापारोद्भवत्वं नः श्रुत्यापि प्रतिपादितम् ।। १८४ ।।

(The state of) Prāṇa etc.[1] is not obtained by mere destruction of ignorance about (the nature of) it, because that (viz. being Prāṇa etc.) is itself an effect. Indeed, leaving aside the cause, there does not follow (what is) an effect (of it).[2] [183]

The worshipper becomes a god (i.e. the deity) in this (mundane existence) and becomes the god (i.e. that deity) owing to the increase in devotion; (this so happens) thanks to human activity—so it is told us even by the Śruti.[3] [184]

SP reiterates the importance of the statement of the *Bhagavadgītā* noted under verse 182 above.

[1]This is the purport of 'Prāṇa etc.' which is the literal meaning.

[2]This verse anticipates an objection: As the knowledge of the Brahman is attained by mere destruction of the ignorance about it, so does one obtain the knowledge of (the deities) Prāṇa (and others) by mere removal of the ignorance about them and consequently there is no need of any worship (*upāsanā*) of the same. The answer is: Attaining the nature of Prāṇa etc. is itself an effect (*kārya*) and therefore it needs some means, i.e. cause (*kāraṇa*); this *kāraṇa* is, it is implied, worship (*upāsanā*).

[3]SP cites the purport of the Śruti passage: *ihaiva dehe bhāvanāprakarṣād devabhāvam anubhūya dehapātād ūrdhvam upāsyo devaḥ*

syāt. Becoming Prāṇa etc. is thus pointed out as what is attainable by human effort or activity (*puruṣatantra*)—this implies the short-time-lasting nature of the result which is unlike the attainment of the nature of the Brahman which is irrespective of human effort or activity (*vastutantra*). This is expressed in the following verse.

ब्रह्मैवाप्येति ब्रह्मैव प्रागप्यासीद्यतोऽद्वयम् ।।
तन्मोहमात्रविध्वंसादित्यपि श्रुतिशासनम् ।। १८५ ।।

And also there is instruction (i.e. declaration) in the Śruti: 'By mere destruction of ignorance about it, he merges into the Brahman itself, since he was, even before, only the unique Brahman'.[1] [185]

[1]*Nṛsiṁhottaratāpanī* U. 5.

स्वतःसिद्धौ तदन्येषां श्रुतिकोपः प्रसज्यते ।।
अतोऽन्यदार्तं तद्वच्चाप्येकमेवेति च श्रुतिः ।। १८६ ।।

If (it is held that) those others (viz. the deities who are other than that Brahman) are self-established, there would arise the contingency of the opposition to (lit. anger of) the Śruti. (Indeed, there is a statement in) the Śruti: 'Everything else than this is affliction'; so also '(it is) but one'.[1] [186]

[1]NKL cites the following Śruti passages: *ato 'nyadārtam* (BU 5.4.2): *neha nānāsti kiṁcana* (BU 6.4.19); *sarvaṁ khalv idam brahma* (CU 3.10.1). Cf. SP: *eko devaḥ sarvabhūteṣu gūḍhaḥ* (*Śvetaśvararopaniṣad* 6.11) and *eka eva tu bhūtātmā* (Brahmabindu U.12)

नाव्याकृतादेः संसिद्धौ परमात्मातिरेकतः ।।
ब्रह्मवन्मानमस्तीह तथा निर्मोक्षतापतेत् ।। १८७ ।।

There is no proof here[1] for establishing (the existence of) the unmanifest (Prāṇa) etc. apart from the highest Reality as there is one[2] in respect of the Brahman. (If that were) so,[3] there would result absence of liberation. [187]

[1]That is, in *pramāṇaprameya* relation which is accepted in the discussion.

[2]This refers to *anubhava*, cf. BSB (*adhyāsabhāṣya*):....*sarvo hy ātmāstīti pratyeti* (pp.79-81)

[3]That is, if the unmanifest were self-established.

अथात्माविद्याव्यक्तादिरूपेण प्रथते तदा ।।
तन्निवृत्तौ निवृत्तिः स्यान्निवृत्तिः केवलात्मता ।। १८८ ।।

If (it were argued that) ignorance about (the true nature of) the Ātman reveals itself in the form of the unmanifest etc., then, in case ignorance ceases to be, there would be the ceasing to be (of even the unmanifest); but cessation (of ignorance) consists indeed in the Ātman's being alone. [188]

In the preceding verse, the argument was based on the assumed reality of Prāṇa etc. Now, in this verse, the argument proceeds from the assumption that the ignorance about Prāṇa etc. consists in the ignorance about the Brahman—this latter ignorance being removed, the former ignorance also would be removed only naturally. The removal of the latter ignorance is but the absence of duality.

प्राणस्येव पराभूतो द्विषन्पाप्मासुरोऽखिलः ।।
उपासीनस्य तं प्राणं कृत्स्नो नश्येत्तथासुरः ।।
द्विषंश्चाप्यद्विषञ्छत्रुरासुरादन्य इष्यते ।। १८९ ।।

[*parāsya dviṣan bhrātṛvyo bhavati* is explained.]

The entire demoniac sin, hating Prāṇa as it were, was defeated. In the same way, the entire demoniac (sin), (hating) him who is worshipping that Prāṇa, would perish (i.e. get destroyed). (A person) who is (actually) hating and even he who is not, is considered as an enemy, (but he is) other than the demoniac sin. [189]

नित्यविघ्नकृदेवैष प्राणाप्तावासुरो मतः ।।
अतो विशेष्यते श्रुत्या द्विषन्भ्रातृव्यरूपया ।। १९० ।।

In respect of attaining (i.e. becoming one with) Prāṇa, this demoniac (sin) is known to be a cause of obstacles forever. Therefore, the word '(who is) the hating' is specified (by the Śruti) in the form of the word 'rival'. [190]

This explains how the word *dviṣan* in the phrase *dviṣan bhrātṛvyaḥ* is significant.

उक्तासुरपराभूतौ नान्योऽरिरवशिष्यते ।।
य एवं वेदेति विधिः फलोक्तेरर्थवादतः ।। १९१ ।।

When there occurs the defeat of the demoniac (sin) as mentioned (in the narrative), there does not remain any other enemy. Then the words: *ya evaṁ veda* are an injunction,[1] since there is the statement of the result, (i.e. there is) an Arthavāda.[2] [191]

[1]Regarding the worship of Prāṇa, or rather the Sūtrātman.
[2]The argument is: There cannot be any Arthavāda unless it is connected with some injunction already laid down. The statement of a reward becomes meaningful, only if a performance has been already prescribed by some injunction.

आनुषङ्गिफलोक्त्या वा तदुपासा विमुक्तये ।।
आत्मविद्याधिकारेऽस्मिंस्तदुपासाविधानतः ।। १९२ ।।

Or by the statement of the incidental reward is prescribed the worship of that (viz. the Ātman) so that liberation is achieved; for, in this discussion on the topic of the knowledge (of the Ātman), there is prescription of the worship of that (viz. Sūtrātman). [192]

आत्मविद्योपकारित्वं तस्माद्वाक्याच्च गम्यते ।। १९३ ।।

And from that statement (in the Śruti)[1] is understood the usefulness (of that) for the lore of the Ātman.[2] [193]

[1]SP quotes BU 6.2.1: *uktopaniṣatkaḥ ito vimucyamānaāḥ kva gamiṣyasi* which refers to *kramamukti*, i.e. first there occurs the *sūtrātmatvaprāpti* and later *mokṣaprāpti*.
[2]The significance of the Śruti is clarified in the next verse.

Verses 194-197 *state the purpose of* BU 1.3.8-1.3.16.

अथायास्याङ्गिरोदूर्भिर्विशिष्टमसुकर्मकम् ।।
उपासनं विधास्यामीत्यारब्धैषोत्तरा श्रुतिः ।। १९४ ।।

This subsequent section of the Śruti has begun with the intention: 'Now let me prescribe the worship which has the

Ātman as its object that is specified by (the names) Ayāsya, Āṅgiras and Dūr.'. [194]

अनुवादाद्विधिर्ज्यायाननुवादे वृथा श्रमः ।।
पुरुषार्थाभिसंबन्धादतो विधिरिहाश्रितः ।। १९५ ।।

(One might say:) 'An injunction is more important than its Anuvāda (re-statement); therefore, there is a futile effort in stating an Anuvāda.'. (Our answer is:) 'Here (i.e. in the Anuvāda) is taken an injunction as its basis, because of its close connection with the purpose of human activity.' [195]

श्रूयते फलसंबन्धो यासूपासासु तास्विह ।।
दध्नेन्द्रियादिवज्ज्ञेयो विधिर्गुणसमाश्रयः ।। १९६ ।।
प्रधानफलसंबन्धो यत्र तु स्याच्च्छ्रुतेर्मुखात् ।।
विशिष्टः स विधिर्ज्ञेयो यथाग्नेयादयस्तथा ।। १९७ ।।

[Verses 196 and 197 clarify the characteristics respectively of a Guṇavidhi and (Guṇa-) Viśiṣṭavidhi.]

In those various worships, in which is heard (in the Śruti) the connection of a reward (with the knowledge about the nature of the Ātman), an injunction related to some subordinate aspect of it is to be understood in the same way as (in the subordinate injunction) 'by curds, (one desirous of) organs etc.' [196]
Where, however, the connection of a reward with the principal reward is heard directly from the statement in the Śruti, that (injunction) has to be understood as a Viśiṣṭavidhi, like (the injunctions) pertaining to Āgneya (*aṣṭākapāla*) etc. [197]

This example from the ritual-procedure is introduced for explaining how Ayāsya Upāsanā is to be considered as a means towards the Ātman Upāsanā. Curds are a means towards the principal rite, viz. that prescribed in *juhuyāt svargakāmaḥ*. The sentence *dadhnā indriya*...refers to the pouring of curds into fire by the use of the instrumental form *dadhnā* in *dadhnā juhoti* and it is somehow related to the principal rite by (1) prescribing the *yāga* and (2) prescribing the material for the *yāga* in addition.

SP refers to the discussion of *pradhānānuvādena guṇavidhiḥ* in the SV. NKL states the similarity between *bhartā śreṣṭhaḥ purogantā* (which is relevant here) and *dandhnā...juhuyāt*.

Verses 198-208 *explain* BU 1.3.8.

अवाप्ताग्न्यादिरूपास्ते प्राणालिङ्गनसंश्रयात् ॥
कृतोपकारं स्मृत्वोचुः प्राणा वागादयस्तदा ॥ १९८ ॥

Those *prāṇas*,[1] viz. speech and others, which obtained the nature of Fire etc. by resorting to Prāṇa, remembered the good turn done to them (by it) and said (to themselves). [198]

[1]The word *prāṇa* refers to the Sūtrātman in its various manifest forms (viz. the various organs), not to the principal Prāṇa; cf. BSB 1.1.23.

अनन्ताग्न्यादिभावेन यो नः सञ्जितवानसुः ॥
क्व न्वसौ वर्तते ह्यात्मा योऽस्मच्छत्रुविनाशकृत् ॥ १९९ ॥

"Where indeed is that Prāṇa who won (i.e. united) us together by granting perennial nature of Fire etc., (the Sūtrātman), the Ātman, which has destroyed our enemies?". [199]

वितर्कयन्तस्ते प्राणा उक्त्वैवं प्रत्यगात्मसु ॥
कुर्वाणमुपकारं तं ददृशुः प्रागिवादरात् ॥ २०० ॥

Thus wondering (about Prāṇa), those *prāṇas* (=sense-organs) said this to themselves and then, as before, respectfully looked upon him, who had done good turn to them, in (i.e. connected with) all the inner selves (i.e. individuals). [200]

लोकेऽपि हि विचार्यार्थमथ संविदते जनाः ॥
यथा वागादयस्तद्वद्विजज्ञुः प्राणमात्मनि ॥ २०१ ॥

As in worldly life also,[1] people indeed first think about things and then come to realize (their nature etc.), so also did Speech and others come to know the Prāṇa[2] within themselves.[3] [201]

Here is stated the basic principle which guides people's behaviour.

[1]The word 'also' implies the ritualistic activities.

[2]This is *mukhya prāṇa*, the Ātman.

[3]The word *ātmani* refers to the body; cf. SP: *kāryaka*(v.l. *kā*)-*raṇasaṁghātaḥ*.

सामान्योक्तावास्य इति तद्विशेषणमुच्यते ।।
अन्तरित्यन्यथा मा भूत्प्रसङ्गः प्राणनिश्चितौ ।। २०२ ।।

After stating (merely) *āsye*, in order to convey the general sense, there is used in the Śruti a modifier *antaḥ*[1] with a view to that, in respect of ascertaining (the exact) Prāṇa,[2] there might not arise any contingency (viz. difficulty). [202]

[1]After the word *āsye* wherein the locative case-suffix was otherwise sufficient to convey the sense of the location.

[2]The word *āsye* alone would refer ever only to the sense of touch that occupied the place in the mouth. This is *clearly stated* in the next verse.

त्वगादयोऽपि सन्त्यास्ये यतोऽतस्तद्विशेषणम् ।।
विशिनष्टि ततः प्राणमास्यान्तर्बिलचारिणम् ।। २०३ ।।

Since the sense of touch etc. also are (seen to abide) in the interior of the mouth, therefore, there is the modifier of that (Prāṇa)[1], that specifies the Prāṇa which moves in the hollow within the mouth. [203]

[1]Namely, *antaḥ* after *āsye* as referred to in the preceding verse.

आस्यपर्यन्तशायीनि त्वगादीनि न मध्यतः ।।
प्राणस्तु मध्य आस्यस्य तस्मादन्तर्विशेषणम् ।। २०४ ।।

The sense of touch etc. (are seen to) abide only up to the (farthest visible) end within the mouth, but (they are) not (seen occupying) the interior (hollow) of it; contrary to this, Prāṇa[1] (abides) in the interior (hollow) of the mouth (also). Therefore, there is here the use of modifier *antaḥ*. [204]

[1]This is *mukhya prāṇa*.

सर्वेन्द्रियाणामथवा प्राण आत्मेति कथ्यते ।।
अयमास्येऽन्तरित्येवमरनाभिनिदर्शनात् ।। २०५ ।।

Or 'the nature[1] of all organs is (finally that of) Prāṇa'; this is said (in the words) 'this one in the interior (hollow) of the mouth'. This (is stated on the basis of) the example of the spokes of a wheel (fixed in the hub[2]). [205]

[1]This is an alternative explanation of *antaḥ*; cf. NKL: *antaḥśabdena vāgādīnaṁ svarūpam prāṇa ucyate.*

[2]Cf. BU 2.5.15. The intended comparison is: As the spokens lie within (i.e. inside) the rim of a wheel, being firmly fixed in the hub, so do the organs, being firmly fixed (i.e. dependent) on the Ātman, lie within the circle of worldly existence.

अयमास्येऽन्तरित्येवं प्राणं दृष्टवा यतः पुरा ।।
व्याजह्रुरमरास्तस्मात्प्राण आयास्यसंज्ञितः ।। २०६ ।।

[The meaningfulness of the name Āyāsya for Prāṇa is explained.]

Since, (on that occasion) in the past, the gods thus saw Prāṇa to be abiding in the interior of the mouth and affirmed it, therefore Prāṇa is named Āyāsya.[1] [206]

[1]Sureśvara cites the name as Āyāsya, this can be explained thus: *ayāsya eva āyāsyaḥ.*

अङ्गानां करणानां च रसः सारो यतस्ततः ।।
प्राण आङ्गिरसः प्रोक्तस्तद्विद्भिस्तन्द्गुणाश्रयात् ।। २०७ ।।

Since it is the essence, i.e. strength, of the limbs, i.e. organs; therefore Prāṇa is called Āṅgirasa by them who have known that, (and as such) basing (the name) on that property (of that). [207]

कथमाङ्गिरसः प्राण इत्यस्य प्रतिपत्तये ।।
अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यामुपरिष्टात्प्रवक्ष्यते ।। २०८ ।।

In order that it may be known as to why Prāṇa is called

Āṅgirasa, there will be stated (an argument) later by the method of Anvaya and Vyatireka. [208]

तथान्योऽपि गुणोऽनस्य दूरिति प्रतिपाद्यते ।।
उदारफलसिद्ध्यर्थं सा वा एषेत्यतः श्रुतिः ।।२०९ ।।

[Verses 209-218 explain BU 1.3.9 which states that Prāṇa is away from having any property.]

In the same way, another quality of Prāṇa also is conveyed in (the name) Dūr. (And the statement) in the Śruti *sā vā eṣa* (proceeds) to establish the excellent reward (accruing from Prāṇa). [209]

उपास्तिक्रमसिद्ध्यर्थं क्रमभङ्गोऽयमिष्यते ।।
यतोऽतोऽङ्गिरसं त्यक्त्वा दूरित्येवाभिधीयते ।। २१० ।।

Since this deviation from the order[1] (in the names of Prāṇa stated in the Śruti) is accepted with a view to establishing the process in worship,[2] therefore (the name) Dūr is expressed (i.e. explained) earlier, having set aside (the name) Aṅgirasa. [210]

[1]This refers to the *Pāṭhakrama* in the *Brāhmaṇa* (i.e. the Upaniṣad).

[2]It literally means 'order in the various acts which comprise worship'.

विशिष्टोपास्तिरेवेयं प्रधानफलकीर्तनात् ।।
नायं गुणविधिर्ज्ञेयस्तत्फलस्याश्रुतत्वतः ।। २११ ।।

This (worship of Dūr) is but the worship of what is qualified, since there is the mention of the principal reward (as accruing from it). (Indeed) this should not be taken as a Guṇavidhi, for there is no mention (lit. hearing) in it of its reward.[1] [211]

[1]That is to say: the reward for the worship alone is going to accrue to the worshipper; there being no separate reward for the worship of Dūr, which is but the same as Prāṇa, merely qualified by the name. This is explained in the next verse.

क्रियायां गुणभूतोऽर्थो देवतेत्युपदिश्यते ।।
अस्त्युपासिक्रियायोगो देवतातोऽत्र उच्यते ।। २१२ ।।

A live being (lit. thing) which has been subordinate[1] in any activity is called the deity and since here (in respect of the act of worship to Dūr) there is such a connection with the act of worship, therefore, it is Prāṇa that is mentioned as the deity. [212]

Rites comprise *dravya* 'material', *devatā* 'deity (to whom material is offered)' and *karman* '(towards which) the act (is directed)'. These three and the pleasure of the gods are regarded as subordinate; i.e. they contribute to make the rite full.

[1]That is, of secondary importance. Read SP: *yāgādau kartratirekeṇa cetano guṇo'gnyādir devatā.*

दूरमेवंविदः पाप्मा कथमध्यवसीयते ।।
एवंवित्त्वविरोधित्वाद्दूरं पाप्मा भवेदतः ।। २१३ ।।

(A question may be asked:) 'How is it decided that the sin of the knower of this (is sent) afar?'. (The answer is:) 'Since the sin goes away on account of its being opposed to the state of one's being the knower of such (a name of Prāṇa).' [213]

विषयेन्द्रियसंबन्धजो हि पाप्मासुरो यतः ।।
श्रौतानन्तादहंमानात्परिच्छिन्नो विरुध्यते ।। २१४ ।।

Since the demoniac sin is what results from the contact of organs and their objects, (therefore, that sin), limited as it is, is distinguished from (lit. opposed to) the infinite Ego (which is) heard in the Śruti.[1] [214]

[1]This refers to the (so-called) Ego (*aham brahmāsmi*) which arises from the knowledge of the Śāstra.

चक्षुरादिपरिच्छेदः प्राकृतज्ञानहेतुतः ।।
युक्तोऽध्यात्मैकरूपस्य बाधः शास्त्राभिमानतः ।। २१५ ।।

Being limited by the eye etc.[1] is on account of the

ignorance which is natural to human beings. Therefore, it is only proper that there is the removal of it which has the form only of some bodily organs by coming to have the awareness (of the true nature of the inner self) by (knowing i.e. with the help of) the Śāstra. [215]

[1]This refers to *cakṣurādyabhimāna* on the part of the deities other than Prāṇa.

परिस्पन्दात्मिका वृत्तिः श्रोत्रादिष्वपि विद्यते ।।
प्राणस्याथेन्द्रियाणां तु शब्दाद्यर्थावलेहिनी ।। २१६ ।।
शब्दादिग्राहिणी वृत्तिः स्वैरासङ्गात्मपाप्मभिः ।।
दूषिता न परिस्पन्दो दूरं मृत्युरसोस्ततः ।। २१७ ।।

The function of Prāṇa which is of the nature of throbbing is noticed to exist in the case of the ear etc. also.[1] But the function of the organs relates to (lit. touches, i.e. is connected with, various) objects, viz. words and others.[2] [216] (Yet,) the function, viz. getting connected with the objects, viz. words etc., is affected by the sin in the form of wanton attachment (to these objects); not so the throbbing of Prāṇa. Therefore, death is far (from that).[3] [217]

[1]This explains how Prāṇa would be noticed as connected with sin.

[2]This is an expression of doubt against the said connection. The argument is: Ear etc. are connected only with their own objects—not with sins!

[3]Verse 217 answers away the doubt. The reason for the said connection is attachment to the objects. The throbbing Prāṇa does not get attached to any of the objects and is therefore away from death.

मृत्युर्दूरं यथा प्राणात्तदात्मत्वात्तथासुरः ।।
तद्विदश्च भवेन्मृत्युर्दूरमित्युपदिश्यते ।। २१८ ।।

As death is far from Prāṇa, so also is the demoniac (sin far from it[1]) since it is the nature of that (viz. death). And it is declared here that death would be far from him who is the knower of that (viz. Prāṇa).[2] [218]

[1]Namely, Prāṇa.

[2]This indicates the purity, freedom from the fear of death etc. of the worshipper of Prāṇa, even as Prāṇa is away from death etc.

Verses 219-227 *explain BU* 1.3.10.

दिशामन्त इह ग्राह्यो मध्यदेशोपलक्षितः ।।
अनन्ताकाशदेशत्वान्नाञ्जसान्तो दिशां यतः ।। २१९ ।।

[This explains *yatrāsāṁ diśām antaḥ*...(BU 1.3.10). Here the explanation given by Śaṅkara—and Sureśvara following him—is not wholly philosophical; it is socio-philosophical, since it reveals some of the bias of their times as is noticed from SP.]

Here the end of quarters is to be taken as that which is defined (or indicated)[1] by the middle region,[2] since it is not reasonable to say that there is the end (i.e. boundary) of quarters, for the region is very wide in space. [219]

[1]The word 'indicated' shows that the division of regions is not so rigid; it only points to two regions of people of two different tendencies.

[2]Region described in the Smṛtis as *Āryāvarta*, viz. the region between Mt. Himalaya and Mt. Vindhya (rather the plains of the Gaṅgā). People of those times believed that the people of *Āryāvarta* followed the religion prescribed by the Śruti and the Smṛti. Therefore, they were pure in their mind and activity and the people other than these did not follow the religion (prescribed by the Śruti and the Smṛti). Therefore, they were impure. Thus there is a division of persons of divine tendencies and those of demoniac tendencies. Consequently, Mṛtyu or death is for them who did not follow the religion of the Śruti and the Smṛti—this religion prevailed in the form of (worldly) religion.

श्रुतिस्मृतिसदाचारसंस्कृताशयवज्जनम् ।।
अवधीकृत्यान्तत्वोक्तेर्नतु दोषो मनागपि ।। २२० ।।

Since there is a statement (made in the Śruti) about the boundary, after having marked out the people who has

thoughts purified by (the study of) the Śruti, the Smṛti and the exemplary conduct (of the elite), there is not even a little defect.[1] [220]

NKL states the purpose of this verse: A Smṛti text reads; *vindhyasya dakṣiṇe bhāge kalau vāsaḥ praśasyate|tatra vedāś ca yajñāś ca yatra godāvarī nadī* // (untraceable); and this indicates that the middle region is the one which is a suitable abode for the learned men (*śrautasmārtakarmasaṁskṛtabuddhīnām puruṣāṇām vāsayogyaḥ*). This is the purpose of *upalakṣita* in *madhyadeśo-palakṣita*; cf. verse 219 above.

[1]This stands for 'defective doing'.

मध्यदेशावधिस्तस्माद्दिगन्त इति गृह्यते ।।
प्रात्यन्तिकजनोद्देशः पापीयोजनसंश्रयात् ।।
वर्ज्यतेऽतः प्रयत्नेन तद्विद्भिरधुनातनैः ।। २२१ ।।

Therefore, by the boundary of the middle region is understood the boundary of the quarters. (And) because the region of the people residing beyond that boundary is resorted to by people that are full of sin(s), it is hence carefully avoided by (even) the moderns who know (that). [221]

This underlines the significance of the contents in the note on the previous verse.

तेषु प्रत्यन्तदेशेषु तन्निवासिषु चासुरान् ।।
यतो विन्यदधात्प्राणस्तस्मात्तद्वर्जयेद्द्वयम् ।। २२२ ।।

Since Prāṇa fixed the demons down there in those regions beyond the limits (of the middle region) and also in the people residing there, therefore, one should avoid the two of them. [222]

This explains the reason (briefly) stated in the preceding verse.

जनो विशिष्टो देशेन देशो जनविशेषितः ।।
पाप्मोपस्पृष्टमुभयं शिष्टास्तद्वर्जयन्त्यतः ।। २२३ ।।

A people is marked out by (its own) region and (so also) is a region marked out by the people (residing in it). Therefore, the elite avoid them both, both of them being affected by sin. [223]

This makes the word *dvayam* 'the two of them' in verse 222 doubly clarified.

समाहारोऽथवा भेदो नेदित्येतत्पदं भवेत् ॥
अनीप्सितानिवृत्तिः स्यात्समाहारेऽविवक्षिते ॥ २२४ ॥

The word *net* could be either a compound or two different words (joined in Saṁdhi). When the compound (i.e. a single word) is not intended, it would be (in the sense:) 'not desisting from some undesired (activity or tendency)'. [224]

इत्थं न चेदहं कुर्या प्रतिषेधश्रुतीरितम् ॥
अन्ववायानि पाप्मानं प्रतिषेधातिलङ्घनात् ॥ २२५ ॥

(In that case, the meaning of the sentence would be:) If I shall not do this way (i.e. behave in this manner), as is declared by the prohibitive Śruti,[1] I might incur (lit. follow) sin by transgressing the prohibition. [225]

[1]The prohibitive rule is *tasmān na janam*...(BU 1.3.10).

इति भेदविवक्षायां व्याख्या कार्या पदद्वये ॥
माङर्थस्तु तथाभेदे व्याख्येयः प्रतिषेधकृत् ॥ २२६ ॥

Such should be the explanation given of the two words, if it is the intention to understand (*net*) to be two different words. So also, if there is (intended) non-difference, (i.e. there are not two words),[1] it is necessary to bring forth the meaning of the prohibitive particle *mā* which conveys the sense of prohibiting.[2] [226]

[1]That is, (if) '*net*' (is accepted) only as one word.
[2]That is, it should mean 'let me not follow sin'.

सामान्यविषयश्चायं निषेधो नानविद्गतः ।।
बलवत्प्रक्रियातो हि वाक्यं सामान्यमात्रगम् ।। २२७ ।।

And this prohibition pertains to (individuals in general), it does not pertain to the knower of Prāṇa, because the sentence of the Śruti pertains only to individuals in general, thanks to the (accepted) procedure in respect of a strong (proof which determines the meaning). [227]

Mīmāṁsā holds relative strength of proofs for determining the meaning of scriptural texts: *śruti*, *liṅga vākya*, *prakaraṇa*, *sthāna* and *samākhyā*. Here *prakaraṇa* 'context' or 'topic' is in conflict with *vākya* and is considered inferior to its precedents, in accordance with the rule regarding the weakness of the subsequent in comparison with its preceding (*pāradaurbalya*).

The basis for the verse is the following (possible doubt): 'What does the prohibition (*māṅartha*) in the preceding verse pertain to, to the worshipper of Prāṇa (the subject of the *prakaraṇa*) or to the worshipper of all deities (the subject of *vākya*)?' The answer is: 'to the latter'.

आसुरेणावरुद्धांस्तान्वागादीन्हतपाप्मनः ।।
देवत्वं प्रापयत्प्राणः कथमित्येतदुच्यते ।। २२८ ।।

[Verses 228-236 explain the purpose of BU 1.3.11-16, i.e. worship of Speech and others secures the reward, viz. becoming the deities, Agni etc.]

(An objection is raised:) 'How has Prāṇa brought to (the divinities) Speech and others who were (first) overpowered by the demoniac (nature) and who had their sins later destroyed?'—this is (now) answered. [228]

ज्ञानतोऽज्ञानहानिः स्याद्देवत्वं भावनाबलात् ।।
आनन्तर्ये क्रियाद्वित्वादथशब्दो भवेद्ध्रुवम् ।। २२९ ।।

'From (the acquisition of) knowledge there follows the destruction of ignorance, and, owing to the strength of devotion, there would be divine character (secured). (As

such), the word *atha* (here in this context) is certainly for (conveying) the sense 'then' or 'later', for there are two actions[1].' [229]

This explains: *athainā mṛtyum atyavahat.*
[1]Namely, meditation (or worship) and knowing.

मृत्युमत्यवहत्प्राणः सामान्योक्तेर्विशेषतः ।।
विशिष्टदेवतावाप्तिर्वागादीनां प्रपञ्च्यते ।। २३० ।।

By the general statement (is conveyed the meaning:) 'Prāṇa took (them) beyond (or over) Mṛtyu' and by the particular statement is explained in detail the attainment of (the nature of) some particular deities by Speech and others. [230]

नेदीयसी यतोऽन्यभ्यो वागेवोद्गीथकर्मणि ।।
प्राणस्य तेन सोद्गातुः प्रथमेत्यभिधीयते ।। २३१ ।।

Since, in the Udgītha ritual, Speech is, in comparison with others, nearer to Prāṇa,[1] therefore, it is described as the first (among the deities of the organs) of the Udgātṛ. [231]

This explains the qualifier *prathamām* of *vācam* in *sā vai vācam eva prathamāṁ atyavahat.*
[1]SP significantly adds: *audgātre karmaṇi sādhakatamatvena prāṇasyodgātur atyantasaṁnihitatvāt.*

वागाद्यग्न्याद्यवाप्त्यैवं पाप्मनोऽपास्य सर्वतः ।।
वैराजं पदमेत्येवं यजमानः सुभावितः ।। २३२ ।।

Having wholly separated (lit. thrown away) Speech and others from the sin by the attainment of (the nature of) Agni etc. (who are their deities), the sacrificer, who is thus well developed in devotion,[1] attains to the status of Virāj. [232]

[1]That is, who has strengthened the devotion, or who is ardently devoted.

कल्याणासङ्गसंबन्धाद्वागाद्यधर्मकारणम् ।।
त्यक्त्वानं मुख्यमात्मानमाश्रयेन्मृत्युवर्जितम् ।। २३३ ।।
वागाद्यैः पञ्चभिर्युक्तं विराजं साधिभौतिकम् ।।
हित्वाध्यात्मपरिच्छेदं ततस्तं प्रतिपद्यते ।। २३४ ।।
साधिभूताधिदैवं च नामरूपक्रियात्मकः ।।
सूत्रं प्राणोऽङ्गिराः सत्यमृक्सामेत्यन उच्यते ।। २३५ ।।

Having abandoned (i.e. thrown away) the cause, viz. impiety of Speech and others, (which had resulted) from the connection (of them) with an attachment to the (so-called) auspicious, (the sacrificer) should resort to the Ātman, the principal Prāṇa, who is free from death, [233] (that sacrificer), having abandoned the limitation of the body, (resorts to) that Virāj, together with what has a basis in the elements (viz. body) which is connected with the five (sense-organs) speech and others,[1] attains Prāṇa.[2] [234] Sentience[3] is called the Sūtrātman,[4] the (principal) Prāṇa, Aṅgiras, Satya, Ṛc and Sāman, having the nature of name, form and activity and being connected with the elements and divinities. [235]

[1]SP and NKL point out; 'this indicates the inclusion of the sense of touch etc.'

[2]That is, status of Prāṇa.

[3]Translation distinguishes *ana* from *mukhya Prāṇa*. Sentience is for *ana*.

[4]Read SP: *napuṁsakaṁ sūtreṇādhyāhṛtaprapañcena ca pumān sambadhyate.*

तमेकं सर्वभूतेषु ज्ञानकर्मफलाश्रयम् ।।
आस्वभावात्मविज्ञानादुपास्ते यः स तं व्रजेत् ।। २३६ ।।

He, who worships that one, the unique, who alone exists in all beings, who is the support of knowledge, (ritual) action and rewards, till (he acquires) the knowledge of (his own) nature (as that) of the Ātman,[1] becomes one with it.[2] [236]

[1]The editor of NKL writes the following note: *sūtram prāṇa iti ābhyām padābhyāṁ kriyātmatvam uktam, aṅgirāḥ satyam ity*

ābhyāṁ rūpātmakatvam, ṛksāmapadābhyāṁ nāmātmakatvaṁ ca prāṇasyoktam bodhyam.

[2]It literally means 'attains to that'.

Verses 237-245 *explain* BU 1.3.17.

उक्तमभ्युदयार्थं यद्वागादीनामथाधुना ।।
आगानमवशिष्टेषु स्तोत्रेषूद्गातुरुच्यते ।। २३७ ।।

As to what was stated in the case of speech and others, (viz. the singing of the Udgītha) is for the material prosperity (for them, i.e. the sacrificer); (now) is stated, in respect of the remaining prayers, (that which is for the sake) of the Udgātṛ (priest). [237]

Among the twelve prayers (*pavamānas*) earlier referred to, the first three are said to bring the reward to the sacrificer, viz. material prosperity. The remaining prayers stand in similar connection with the Udgātṛ priest.

सामान्यभोज्यविषयस्त्वन्नशब्दो यतस्ततः ।।
आद्यमित्युच्यते तस्य विशेषणतया वचः ।। २३८ ।।

Since the word *anna* refers to the commonly accepted eatable (foods), therefore, a statement is made about that in the word *ādya* 'fit to be eaten'[1] (which is) its qualifier. [238]

This verse explains the second member *ādya* in the compound *annādya* and sets aside the possible doubt of repetition.

[1]Cf. SP: *tasyaiva* (=*annasya*) *saṁskṛtatvaṁ viśeṣam.*

यत आदाविदं वृत्तमन्नागानमनात्मनि ।।
तस्मात्तत्कार्यभूतासु प्रजास्वद्यापि दृश्यते ।। २३९ ।।

Since this incident, viz. the singing for food, first[1] occurred in respect of the non-Ātman,[2] therefore that[3] is noticed even today in the case of people (lit. the offsprings of that Prāṇa) who are but the product of the same. [239]

[1]This refers to Prajāpati who was connected with Speech and others. Therefore, there is a reference to this as the first occurrence. Prajāpati is understood as other than the Ātman.

[2]This emphasises the notion about Prajāpati as non-Ātman.

[3]It signifies people's satisfying their own desire for food (cf. the note of the editor of NKL: *svārtham annasvīkaraṇam iti śeṣaḥ*).

यद्धि किंचेति सर्वार्थमेवेत्यत्रावधारणम् ॥
प्राणेनैव तु तत्सर्वं लोकोऽन्नं ह्यत्ति सर्वदा ॥ २४० ॥

In the words *yadd hi kiṁ ca* (in the Śruti statement), there is the specification: 'for the sake of all', (expressed) in the word *eva*. (The sense of the sentence is:) Therefore, people ever eat all food only through Prāṇa indeed. [240]

अन्नोपकारः सर्वेषामविशिष्टः समीक्ष्यते ॥ २४१ ॥
अथावधारणं कस्मादनेनैवेति भण्यते ॥
प्राणद्वारक एवैषामुपकारो न तु स्वतः ॥ २४२ ॥

This benefit (resulting) from food is noticed to be the same[1] for all. [241]
Now (a question could be asked:) 'Why then is this specification "only through Prāṇa"?'. Therefore, (to answer this, it is said:) 'This benefit for (all) these (people) occurs only through Prāṇa and not on (the basis of merit or strength) of their own.'. [242]

[1]It means 'not specified or distinguished as different for different individuals'.

कथं तद्द्वारकस्तेषामुपकार इतीर्यते ॥
ननु दूरिति हि प्राण उक्तो वागादिवत्कथम् ॥
आत्मार्थान्नाद्यसंगीतेर्विद्धो नासुरपाप्मभिः ॥ २४३ ॥

Now is stated[1] as to how this benefit (accrues) to them (i.e. the people) through that (Prāṇa). (A question is asked:) 'How indeed is Prāṇa, who is called Dūr was not, like

Speech and others, pierced by the demoniac sins, on account of the singing for food for its own sake[2]?' [243]

[1]This refers to the sentence: *iha pratitiṣṭhati.*

[2]The word *ātman* in the compound *ātmārtham* is a reflexive pronoun.

स्थितिमात्राभिसंबन्धान्नायं दोष इहेष्यते ।। २४४ ।।

(The answer is:) 'It is understood here[1] that this is not a fault, for there is connection (of food etc.)[2] merely for the sustenance (of worldly life.)[3]' [244]

[1]The word *iha* means 'in the statement of the Śruti': *ihānnam pratitiṣṭhati* where *iha* stands for Prāṇa.

[2]The words 'with Prāṇa, the inner self called Dūr' is to be supplied.

[3]There is no common 'desire' for food and, therefore, no sin.

असावन्नं स्थितं यस्माद्देहं प्राणानवत्यतः ।।
यत्नाच्छ्रुतिरतो वक्ति त्विहान्नं प्रतितिष्ठति ।। २४५ ।।

Since food is resting on the Ātman,[1] therefore, it protects *prāṇas* (the sense-organs) (and) the body—therefore, the Śruti states, with emphasis (or special care): *ihānnam pratitiṣṭhati.* [245]

A first interpretation is made here of *ihānne pratitiṣṭhati.* Read SP: *iha prāṇe doṣo nodbhāvyaḥ sarvasādhāraṇasthityarthatayā tenānnasvīkārāt prāṇasthityadhīnā hi vāgādisthitiḥ.* Or NKL: *tasmin prāṇe pratiṣṭhitaṁ sad annaṁ deham prāṇāṅś cāvati.*

[1]That is *mukhya prāṇa.*

Verses 246-252 *explain* BU 1.3.18.

स्थितिमात्रं ह्यसोरन्नं यद्वासङ्गो न शङ्क्यते ।।
भर्ता श्रेष्ठः पुरो गन्ता ह्यन्नादोऽधिपतिस्तथा ।।
इत्यादिगुणविध्यर्थं परो ग्रन्थोऽवतार्यते ।। २४६ ।।

Or rather, food (for the Prāṇa) is merely for the sustenance (of the body); any attachment to food (and the consequent

sin) cannot be thought of (in the case of Prāṇa).[1] (Now) the subsequent Śruti is introduced for prescribing the Guṇavidhi: 'the supporter, the best of them, the one who marches ahead, the eater of food and the Lord etc.'[2] [246]

[1]A second interpretation of *ihānne pratitiṣṭhati*. Read SP: *sarvasādhāraṇasthityarthānnayogāt prāṇasya pāpmavedho na.* This is Śaṅkara's alternative explanation: *iha dehākāraparinate anne prāṇaḥ tiṣṭhati.*

[2]The word 'etc.' refers to gold and other belongings. This is the ultimate result of the Śruti statement: *te devā abruvan/etāvad vā idaṁ sarvaṁ yad annam ātmana āgāsīḥ/ anu no annam ābhajasva.*

अयं गुणविधिर्ज्ञेयः प्रत्येकं तत्फलश्रुतेः ।। २४७ ।।
जग्धमन्नं यतो देहलिङ्गभावेन याति नः ।।
परिणामं व्रजत्तस्मादेतावदिति भण्यते ।। २४८ ।।

Let this[1] be understood as a Guṇavidhi, because there is heard a reward in the case of each (of the two sentences).[2] [247] Since the food that is eaten by us becomes transformed into the body and (also) its subtle form, thus developing its monification(s); therefore, is the word *etāvat* 'this much' stated in the Śruti.[3] [248]

[1]Refer to *te devā abruvan*...quoted in note 2 on the preceding verse. But this verse explains the significance of *etāvat*.

[2]The second sentence (i.e. *vidhi*) is: *so ayāsya*...(BU 1.3.19).

[3]This refers to *etāvad vā idaṁ sarvaṁ yad annam ātmana āgāsīḥ.*

त्वयैवात्मार्थमागीते त्वय्येवान्नमतोऽखिलम् ।।
वयं चान्नमृते स्थातुं नालं क्षणमपीश्वर ।। २४९ ।।

When you yourself have sung for your own sake, all food is (resting, lit. obtained) in you. And, as for us,[1] we cannot live without food even for a moment, O Lord! [249]

This explains: *tad ātmana āgāsīḥ.*

[1]Refer to the word *ca*. And the popular maxim: *svāmini bhṛt-*

yenātmīyāpan nivedyā; simile of master-servant relationship, viz. the feeder-fed or the supporter-supported relationship'. (cf. *Laukikanyāyāñjaliḥ*. vol. 2, Bombay, Nirnaya Sagar Press, 1925, p. 90)

संतर्प्यातः स्वमात्मानमन्नेनास्मानपीश्वर ।।
आभाजयस्व क्षुधितांश्छान्दसत्वाण्णिचोऽश्रवः ।। २५० ।।

Therefore, 'O Lord! Having satisfied yourself by this food, make us, the hungry ones,[1] also share of that food. (In the Śruti) is not heard the causal form, owing to its character of Chandas.[2] [250]

This verse explains: *anu no 'sminn anna ābhajasva.*

[1]The use of 'O Lord' and 'us, the hungry ones', which are used in contrast, points to the relation of one who favours and the one who is favoured. 'The Lord' is a reference to the sacrificer(s); (cf. note by of the editor of NKL: *īśvaraśabdaḥ yajamānaparaḥ*). The hungry ones are then the priests.

[2]The Śruti uses the verbal form *ābhajasva* which Sureśvara has paraphrased as *ābhājayasva* (a causal form). Then, he points to the practice of Chandas, i.e. Veda, of using primitive verbal forms in the place of causal ones.

मामृतेऽन्नं न वः शक्तं पोष्टुं क्षणमपि क्वचित् ।।
अन्नार्थिनोऽतो मां सर्वेऽप्यभिसंविशताशु वै ।। २५१ ।।

"Without me (i.e. in my absence) food cannot, by any chance (*kvacit*)[1], nourish you even for a moment, therefore, all of you, who desire for food, (do you) enter into me quickly indeed." (So said Prāṇa to them). [251]

This explains: *te vai mābhisaṁviśateti/ tatheti taṁ samantam pariṇyaviśanta/ tasmād yad annenānnam atti tenaitās tṛpyanti.*

[1]Or alternatively, 'anywhere'.

Verses 253-280 *explain how the deities of Speech and others are satisfied when Prāṇa has eaten the food.*

तेनैता देवताः सर्वास्तृप्यन्त्यन्नेन सर्वशः ।।
इत्यर्थस्य कुतः सिद्धिरिति चेदुच्यते यतः ।। २५२ ।।

त्रिधा जग्धं भवत्यन्नं परिणामविशेषतः ॥
स्थवीयान्मध्यमोऽणीयानित्येवं कालतोऽग्नितः ॥ २५३ ॥
स्थवीयान्यात्यधोभागो रसादिक्रमशोऽपरः ॥
स्थूलं ह्युपचिनोतीमं कुड्यं मृत्स्नेव सर्वदा ॥ २५४ ॥
यस्त्वणीयान्त्रसः सूक्ष्मः स ऊर्गमृतमुच्यते ॥
नाडीः सूक्ष्माः प्रविश्यासौ देवताः प्रीणयत्यथ ॥ २५५ ॥

[SP states that verses 253 ff. are an explanation which has no basis in both BU and BUB. NKL states: there is *udgrantha* (*-parihāra*).]

(The Śruti says:) 'All these deities ever[1] become satisfied by that food[2]'—whence[3] can this meaning be established?' If (this is asked), here is given the answer: 'Since [252] food that is eaten becomes threefold owing to the particular (and different) modifications of it: digested in the forms: gross, subtle and of middle size, owing to passage of time and to the fire (within the belly). [253] The gross (modification) goes as the lower part[4] (i.e. bodily excretion) and the other as *rasa* etc. in order and that (all these being together) ever forms this (gross body) like the soft clay[5] which forms a thatched wall. [254] And[6] that (part) which is thinner (than the first two), is the subtle (*rasa*) that is called *ūrj* (or, 'energy'), the nectar, after it has entered (these) very thin veins, it pleases the deities[7] also.[8] [255]

This has a basis in some other Śruti: *annam aśitam tredhā vidhīyate* (CU 6.5.1), (NKL).

[1]Translation follows the variant *sarvadā* for *sarvaśaḥ* 'in every way' as read in the in AnSS and NKL texts.

[2]That is, through Prāṇa's eating of food.

[3]That is, on what basis...

[4]This should be *adhobhāgam* 'to the lower part (as excretion)'.

[5]Cf SP: *praśastā saṁskṛtā mṛn mṛtsnety ucyate.*

[6]Or alternatively, 'As for, that...(two), it is...'

[7]This signifies the different sense-organs.

[8]This is for *atha* in the sense of *api* (SP).

स्वाम्यर्थं एव चोत्तम्भस्तृप्तिरापूर उच्यते ॥
ततस्तु या सुखोद्भूतिर्विज्ञानात्मन एव सा ॥ २५६ ॥

The sustenance (of the body) is only for the sake of the master (i.e. Prāṇa)[1]. Satisfaction is what is called filling and, whatever happiness then results is for (i.e. accrues to) only the knowing Ātman (the inner self, viz. Prāṇa)[2]. [256]

[1]The stress on the *svāmi-bhṛtya* (or *sva-svāmi*) relation is for ruling out the elemental nature (*bhautikatva*) of Prāṇa. *svāmyartha* is *kāryakaraṇasaṁghātārtha* (i.e. *dehārtha*).
[2]This sets aside the possible doubt that happiness also belongs to the *kāryakaraṇasaṁghāta*.

ता एता देवताः सप्तदश ज्ञानक्रियात्मिकाः ॥
सोऽयं सप्तदशग्रामो भोक्तुः करणलक्षणः ॥ २५७ ॥

Thus, these are the seventeen deities, having the nature of knowledge and activity and this is the group of the seventeen, having the form of the organs of the enjoyer. [257]

This explains the nature of the deities pleased by *rasa* (mentioned in verse 255 above).

बुद्धीन्द्रियाणि पञ्चैव तथा कर्मेन्द्रियाण्यपि ॥
वायवः पञ्च बुद्धिश्च मनः सप्तदशं विदुः ॥ २५८ ॥

They[1] know (the group of) the seventeen thus: The five organs of sense and also (the five organs) of activity, the five winds, intellect and *manas*. [258]

This refers to the *liṅgaśarīra* 'subtle body' (SP).
[1]Namely, those who can make out (i.e. who are knowers).

अपास्ताध्यात्मरूपाणां देवतानां समाश्रयः ॥
भूतपञ्चकमेवेदं साधारण्याद्भवेत्सदा ॥ २५९ ॥

(And) ever[1] this group of five elements itself became the support of the deities which have (thus) given up their

bodily forms, owing to its being (shared by them) in common. [259]

[1]This stresses the idea of the support available for both the gross and the subtle bodies.

पयोम्भोवदिदं लिङ्गं नानारूपैः समन्वितम् ।।
आविर्भावतिरोभावैः कारणात्मनि वर्तते ।। २६० ।।

This subtle body, which is possessed of many forms on account of the manifestations and concealments (of some of them), remains (permanently) in the nature of its own cause,[1] just like milk and water.[2] [260]

[1]This is a reference to the manifestation of the Ātman in the collective and individual (*samastavyasta*) forms.

[2]That is to say: As milk appears in the form of curds etc. and water, in the form of ice etc. The illustration and terminology reveal the basic Sāṁkhya notion about the so-called creation.

कूटस्थबोधतन्मोहचिदाभासैकमात्रया ।।
जाग्रत्स्वप्नावयं पीत्वा ह्यास्ते प्राणात्मना प्रभुः ।। २६१ ।।

[The stress on the word *ābhāsa* may be noted. This is of cardinal importance in Sureśvara's writing. Verse 261 is the description of the deep sleep state of the Ātman, viz. Prājña, verse 262 of the Sūtrātman and verse 263 of the waking state of the Ātman. These verses are *anukta* portion 'not in Bhāṣya but implied elsewhere'.]

By means of the unique *mātrā*,[1] which is but the appearance of Sentience owing to the widely known ignorance or knowledge about (then ature of) in respect of the immutable (i.e. Ātman), this Lord first absorbs into Himself (lit. drinks) the waking and dream states of Himself and then remains in the state of Prāṇa alone. [261]

[1]*mātrā*=Prājña state of the Ātman. It seems that NKL holds this verse as an explanation of *m* in *aum*; it symbolises sleep.

अपास्ताशेषबाह्यार्थस्तज्जवासनयाञ्चितः ।।
अध्वस्तप्रत्यगज्ञानो विरिञ्चः पर उच्यते ।। २६२ ।।

(And Prāṇa) who is beyond this (i.e. the inner self etc.) is called Viriñca (=the first sacrificer), the one who has thrown away all of the external objects, who is marked by the impressions produced by them[1] and whose ignorance about the inner self is not (yet fully) destroyed. [262]

NKL holds this as an explanation of what is symbolised by *u* in *aum*, viz. the Sūtrātman.

[1]This refers to *aśeṣabāhyārtha*.

जाग्रत्काले विशेषेण स्थित्वा हृदयसद्मनि ।।
द्वासप्ततिसहस्राणि नाडीर्व्याप्यावतिष्ठते ।। २६३ ।।

Residing in the home, viz. the heart, at the time of the waking, in some particular way, (the Lord) remains there occupying the seventy-two thousand veins. [263]

This is, according to NKL, referring to *a* in *aum*.

स एष परमात्मैव स्वात्ममोहसहायवान् ।।
प्राणात्मना करोत्येष पश्यत्यग्न्यात्मना तथा ।। २६४ ।।

And this one[1] is but (i.e. none other than) the highest Ātman Himself—He, who has a companion in[2] the ignorance about His own nature. He does His functions, being in the form of *prāṇas* (organs) and also sees (all), being in the form of Agni. [264]

[1]This one who is described in verses 261-263 above. It asserts the oneness of all the three mentioned in those verses.

[2]In other words; who is aided by.

इन्द्राग्नी ताविमावुक्तौ प्राण इन्द्रस्तयोर्मतः ।।
प्रकाशकत्वाद्वागग्निरेवमेकः प्रजापतिः ।। २६५ ।।
अन्त्राद्यभेदतो द्वौ वा यदि वाध्यर्ध उच्यते ।।
यदि वायं त्रयस्त्रिंशद्द्वासप्ततिरथापि वा ।। २६६ ।।

These two[1] are called Indra and Agni and *prāṇa* is understood to be Indra of the two on account of his illumining.[2] Thus is Speech Agni[3]—thus, there is (but) one Prajāpati[4]. [265] If he is declared to be two owing to (the existence of) the two discrete individual objects, viz. the eater and the eatables, or (perhaps as) one and half,[5] or thirty-three[6] or seventy-two[7] (he is just one yet). [266]

[1]*prāṇa* 'organs' and Agni mentioned in the preceding verse.

[2]That means 'bringing sensation etc. or knowledge'.

[3]Cf. verse 324 below.

[4]Read SP: *uktanītyā kriyāśaktimadrūpeṇa kartā jñānaśaktimadrūpeṇa jñātety ekaḥ paramātmanaiva sūtradeham āpannaḥ san kartrādyātmana tiṣṭhatīti.*

[5]Prāṇa is one and the world is half—thus one and half (NKL).

[6]These are eight Vasus, eleven Rudras, twelve Ādityas, Indra and Prajāpati—these are the *vibhūtis* 'special manifestations' of Prāṇa.

[7]The same as in the preceding note with minor divisions of them, so that they correspond to the number of the veins in a body.

अनन्तभेदभिन्नो वा एक एवान उच्यते ।।
सर्वोऽप्येष विकल्पश्च पुनरेकैकशस्तथा ।। २६७ ।।

Or, even though only one, Prāṇa is differentiated in innumerable discrete individual objects and each of all these is further divided in the same way (infinitely). [267]

देवासुरादिभेदेन जातिरूपक्रियागुणैः ।।
एकैकोऽनन्ततां याति पुनरेकात्मतामतः ।। २६८ ।।

(Thus) by (such) division into the gods and the demons, on the ground of the (different) genera, forms, activities and qualities, each one (of these distinct objects) becomes infinite and finally once again attains the nature of only one (Ātman). [268]

समस्तव्यस्ततैवेह प्रत्यगज्ञानभूमिका ।।
न त्वपास्तसमस्तान्ध्ये नेति नेति परात्मनि ।। २६९ ।।

Here unity and multiplicity[1] is but the phase of the ignorance (aboutt he nature) of the inner self, but (it does) not (exist) in the highest Ātman from whom all darkness (i.e. ignorance) is removed (as expressed) in the words *neti neti.* [269]

[1]Or alternatively, 'collectivity and individuality'.

सर्वेणैव विकल्पेन यथोक्तेनावतिष्ठते ।।
यथाधिकारं सर्वत्र परो जगति सर्वथा ।। २७० ।।

At all events (then), the highest one abides in the world in the form of all these discrete objects etc., as described before, according to the requirement of each (of them). [270]

न हि कृत्स्नमनादाय जगदेतन्मनागपि ।।
क्रियायै कारकं किंचित्तस्मात्सर्वात्मनेहते ।। २७१ ।।

Indeed, no agent is capable of any activity without taking even a little of this entire world, therefore (it is said: it is the highest Ātman) who, assuming the forms of all of these, acts.[1] [271]

[1]The verbal root *īh* has the sense 'to act'; cf. the word *īhā* in verse 126 above.

कारणात्मा जगत्कृत्स्नं श्रौतदर्शनसाधनः ।।
यतः प्रागकरोत्कर्म तत्कार्येऽपि तथा ततः ।। २७२ ।।

Since the Ātman, who is of the nature of the cause (of everything and) who has as his means what is prescribed (lit. seen) in the Śruti, has formerly produced (lit. made) the whole of the world (consisting in varied objects), therefore, there exists similar activity in his products (viz. in the world) also. [272]

एकापूर्वप्रयुक्तत्वात्समस्तव्यस्तरूपिणाम् ।।
सर्वः सर्वमुपादाय सर्वत्रातः प्रवर्तते ।। २७३ ।।

Since they are impelled by the unique *apūrva* 'not preceded

by anything' (viz. the Sūtrātman), therefore, all of (those who have the) forms of unity and of multiplicity proceed to act everywhere, taking up all (other things as the means of activity). [273]

अध्यात्माद्यधिभूताधिदैवतं सर्वदाखिलम् ।।
सर्वं सर्वक्रियाः कुर्यादेकापूर्वप्रयुक्तितः ।। २७४ ।।

All of it,[1] viz. what begins with bodily forms[2] and what rests on elements and what on deities, would ever[3] perform all activities, thanks to the impulse by the unique *apūrva* (viz. the Sūtrātman), [274]

[1]This refers to the agents of various activities noticed in the world.

[2]The word 'etc.' indicates minor divisions of these forms (SP and NKL).

[3]SP remarks: *sarvadety ādāne karaṇe ca sambadhyate*. This should require the following translation: '...would ever perform all activities, always taking up the various means, thanks...'

यतः प्रजापतिः पूर्वमेतस्मिन्दर्शने स्थितः ।।
यज्ञेन कर्मणास्राक्षीज्जगदेतच्चराचरम् ।। २७५ ।।

since, in this lore (of this Upaniṣad), Prajāpati, who has appeared earlier (than all creation), has therefore produced by his activity (viz. the performance of sacrifice) this world, movable and immovable. [275]

नाड्योऽस्य रश्मयोऽनन्ता हृदयं मण्डलं रवेः ।।
अहोरात्राणि तावच्च शतसंवत्सरायुषः ।। २७६ ।।
एतया संपदा पूर्वं यजमानेन तद्विदा ।।
अग्नयोऽर्काश्चिता आसन्षट्च त्रिंशत्सहस्रशः ।। २७७ ।।

The innumerable veins of this one[1] are rays, this one's heart, the orb of the Sun. Of him,[1] who has the life of a hundred years, the days and nights are also as many; [276] as the thirty-six thousand (bricks), (called) Agni and Arka, were earlier collected with this amplitude[2] (of trans-

formation in the sacrifice performed) by him, the sacrificer who knows that (amplitude). [277]

[1]Namely, the sacrificer.
[2]This refers to *saṁkhyāsāmānyayoga* 'connection with similarity in number'.

एकैकस्मिन्परिस्पन्द एवं सर्वापि देवता ।।
एका चानेकरूपा च ह्यध्यात्मादिविभागतः ।। २७८ ।।

Thus, the deity in its fullness was present in each of the activities (of that first sacrificer) of one (particular form) and of many forms on account of the division based on bodily forms etc.[1] [278]

[1]Cf. verse 274 above and the next.

विभ्वी सर्वगतानन्ता समाप्ता च प्रतिक्रियम् ।।
प्रतिद्रव्यफलं कृत्स्ना खण्डादौ गोत्ववत्स्थिता ।। २७९ ।।

(That) one deity, all-pervading, residing in many, infinite and fulfiling[1] its purpose in every activity, abides in its full form (in all the effects) in the same way as cowness abides in various parts (i.e. bodies of cows). [279]

[1]The word *samāptā* is for *samāptavātī* (=*samāpayantī*).

एष प्रजापतेरुक्तो महिमा तद्वदेव तु ।।
यजमानोऽपि तादात्म्यात्तथैव भवति ध्रुवम् ।। २८० ।।

Thus is described (here) the greatness of Prajāpati. And, indeed, just in the same way does the sacrificer also become possessed of similar greatness owing to his (attaining) oneness with him (=Prajāpati). [280]

Verses 281-285 *explain evaṁ ha vā enam...ya evaṁ veda* (BU 1.3.18).

गुणोपास्तिफलोक्त्यर्थमेवं हेति श्रुतिः परा ।।
यथोक्तार्थमुपासीनं प्रति प्रववृतेऽधुना ।। २८१ ।।

The subsequent Śruti text *evam ha*...now proceeds with the purpose to state the reward of the subordinate (form of) worship with reference to a worshipper of him (i.e. Prajāpati), who has been described (before). [281]

वागादयोऽभिसंविष्टा जीवनार्थमनं यथा ।।
ज्ञातयोऽभिविशन्त्येवं तद्विदं जीवनार्थिनः ।। २८२ ।।

As Speech and others entered into Prāṇa from all sides (*abhi*) for their life, so do the relatives enter (him) who knows that (viz. Prāṇa) from all sides, having a longing for life. [282]

भर्ता च संनिविष्टानां श्रेष्ठश्च गुणतो भवेत् ।।
यथोक्तगुणवैफल्यं पुरएता न चेद्भवेत् ।। २८३ ।।

And he would be the supporter of those who have resorted to him (and) the most prominent (among them)[1] because of his excellence (only) if he does not go at the head (of them)[2] and if there does not result (from that doing) futility of excellence which is stated earlier. [283]

[1]SP points out the significance *bhartṛ* and *śreṣṭha* as the qualifier of a Kṣatriya and a Brāhmaṇa sacrificer respectively.

[2]This implies; marching at the head of others is permissible in the case of a king; a Brāhmaṇa, though possessed of excellence, should not march ahead of the king; if he does so, his excellence would be useless.

सर्वमेतद्वृथैव स्यान्न चेद्दीप्ताग्निमान्भवेत् ।।
अन्नाद इत्यतो वक्ति साफल्यप्रतिपत्तये ।। २८४ ।।

All this would be futile indeed, if he would not have enkindled the fire,[1] therefore, (the Śruti) states: 'He is the eater of the food', in order that one understood (thereby) the fruitfulness of his activity. [284]

[1]The words 'for the performance of a sacrifice' are to be supplied.

द्विषत्सु स्वेषु च न चेदाधिपत्यं तथापि च ।।
प्रोक्तवैफल्यमाशङ्क्य ह्याहाधिपतितां फलम् ।। २८५ ।।

And, indeed, (the Śruti) declared rulership as the result, because it feared that there might be failure[1] in respect of what was said earlier and if (the sacrificer) would not have mastery over his relatives and those who are his haters. [285]

[1]It literally means 'fruitlessness or inutility'.

Verses 286-289 *explain the purpose of ya u haivam...bhāryebhyo bhavati.*

प्राण आत्मेत्युपासीनो यथोक्तं फलमश्नुते ।।
तज्ज्ञातयोऽपि फलिनो यथा वागादयस्तथा ।। २८६ ।।

One, who has performed worship with the notion that Prāṇa is the Ātman, enjoys the reward as stated in the Śruti (and) his relatives also would have received rewards in the same way as Speech and others (have received that reward through Prāṇa). [286]

प्राणसंस्पर्धिनो यद्वद्विनेशुरसुरास्तथा ।।
प्राणविद्विद्विषः सर्वे नालं भार्येभ्य एव च ।। २८७ ।।

And as the demons who had rivalry with Prāṇa perished, so do (perish) all those who hate the knower of Prāṇa and they are not capable of (offering protection to) their dependents.[1] [287]

[1]The word *bhārya* means 'who is to be supported, a dependent'. SP justifies this by citing *brāhmaṇebhyo vedavidbhyo dive dive namaskuryān nāślīlaṁ kīrtayet* (*Taittirīyāraṇyaka* 2.15.1).

उद्बुभूषति यो द्वेषात्स्वेषु प्राणविदं प्रति ।।
प्रतिस्पर्धी न सोऽलं स्याद्भरणाय कथंचन ।। २८८ ।।

[Here is the explanation of *pratibubhūṣati*.]

Whosoever amongst his relatives would seek to be superior to the knower of Prāṇa,[1] owing to his hatred (towards him), and (also) to be his rival would not in any way be able to support (them[2]). [288]

[1]That is, who would try to overpower the knower of Prāṇa.
[2]It means 'his own relatives'; the word *bhārya* from the preceding verse is understood.

नासौ श्रेष्ठः पुरोगन्ता नान्नादोऽसुरवद्भवेत् ।।
न च ज्ञातिष्वधिपतिः स्पर्धमानोऽनवेदिना ।। २८९ ।।

He, the one moving at the head of them, would not be the most prominent, and the eater of food; he would be like a demon. He would not be the overlord among his relatives; (he) who is vying with the knower of Prāṇa.[1] [289]

[1]It means 'the worshipper of Prāṅa' (*ana-vedin*).

सोऽयास्याङ्गिरसः प्रोक्तस्तत्रायास्यो यथा तथा ।।
निर्णीतः प्रागथेदानीमाङ्गिरस्त्वविनिर्णयः ।। २९० ।।

[Verses 290-294 explain BU 1.3.19; Prāṇa is Āṅgirasa.]

That one (i.e. Prāṇa) was mentioned earlier as Ayāsya Āṅgirasa[1] and the word *ayāsyaḥ* there was herebefore (i.e. in the above) explained somehow.[2] Now (follows) the decision regarding his being Āṅgiras.[3] [290]

[1]This refers to the Śruti passage *so 'yāsya āṅgirasaḥ aṅgānāṁ rasaḥ...*; in this verse, Sureśvara adopts double Saṁdhi of *ayāsyaḥ āṅgirasaḥ*.
[2]For *yathā tathā*.
[3]It is noticeable that Sureśvara made no difference between Āṅgirasa and Āṅgiras. And also between Aṅgiras and Aṅgirasa.

पूर्वोक्तस्यानुवादोऽयं सोऽयास्येत्याद्युपक्रमः ।।
श्रुत्याङ्गिरस्त्वसिद्ध्यर्थमुच्यते न्यायपूर्वकम् ।। २९१ ।।

This introductory *so 'yāsya*...is Anuvāda (=re-statement) of what is said earlier. (Now) the (following) is stated by the Śruti, putting forth first an illustration for establishing the nature (of Prāṇa) as Āṅgiras. [291]

This is to justify how so *'yāsya*...(BU 1.3.19), though far from *ayam āsye antar iti so' yāsya āṅgiraso 'ṅgānāṁ hi rasaḥ* (BU 1.3.8) is connected with the former.

सिद्धोऽङ्गानां रसः प्राणः प्राणोऽङ्गानां रसः कथम् ॥
हीति हेतावतः प्राह तव्याख्यानाय चोत्तरः ॥ २९२ ॥

(A question is asked: '(You say), "it is established that Prāṇa is the essence of the limbs.". (Tell me then) how Prāṇa is the essence of limbs.' (The answer is:) 'The word *hi* is expressive of the reason; therefore, the subsequent (part of the Śruti follows, with a view to explaining that (viz. how etc.)'. [292]

यस्मात्कस्माच्चिदङ्गाद्धि प्राण उत्क्रामतीह नुः ॥
नीरसं सत्तदेवाङ्गमाशु शुष्यति तत्र च ॥ २९३ ॥

'Because, in this world (*iha*), only that limb of a man, from whichsoever Prāṇa departs, dries up very soon, then and there, becomes devoid of the essence.' [293]

यत एवमिदं दृष्टमन्वयव्यतिरेकतः ॥
तस्मादाङ्गिरसः प्राणो ज्ञेय आत्मेति पण्डितैः ॥ २९४ ॥

Since this is so seen (i.e. understood) by the method of Anvaya and Vyatireka, therefore, the learned have to know the Āṅgirasa Prāṇa as the Ātman. [294]

Verses 295-300 *explain* BU 1.3.20-21. [Prāṇa is Bṛhaspati and Brahmaṇaspati.]

कार्यस्य रूपभूतस्य कर्मणः करणस्य च ॥
न केवलं प्राण आत्मा नाम्नोऽप्यात्मेति भण्यते ॥ २९५ ॥

Prāṇa is the Ātman not merely of the product[1] which has been (his) form and of the activity of his organ; but he is called the Ātman of the name also. [295]

Thus begins the explanation of *eṣa u eva bṛhaspatiḥ...*

[1]This is a reference to the word *jagat*. The use of the singular forms *kāryasya* and *karmaṇaḥ karaṇasya* is in the sense of the plural.

एवं सर्वात्मकत्वेन स्तुवन्प्राणं प्रयत्नतः ।।
आदरं कुरुते शास्त्रमुपास्यत्वाय देहिनाम् ।। २९६ ।।

Thus specially praising[1] the Prāṇa as being the nature of all (that makes up the world), the Śruti shows great regard (for Prāṇa), in order that it becomes the object of worship for human beings. [296]

[1]In other words; praising with particular care.

बृहस्पत्यादिभिर्धर्मैरसोरन्यदुपासनम् ।।
विशिष्टमभिधित्स्वाह शास्त्रं पूर्ववदेव च ।। २९७ ।।

(Now), even as before, the Śruti states (what follows), wishing to prescribe some other special[1] (form of) worship (of Prāṇa) by (referring to) the other properties, viz. (his being) Bṛhaspati etc.[2] [297]

[1]That is, as having reference to the properties of Bṛhaspati and others.

[2]SP observes that these injunctions are not Gaṇavidhis; they are Viśiṣṭavidhis. The reason for this is: All of them have but one (viz. the principal) purpose—*sāmnaḥ sāyujya*.

वाग्व्यापृततमा दृष्टा यत उद्गीथकर्मणि ।।
देवता सैव न प्राण इत्याशङ्क्येवेदमुच्यते ।। २९८ ।।

This is so stated after keeping in view the doubt "Since Speech is the most active (lit. functioning) in the ritual of the Udgītha, therefore it is the deity (of that service), not Prāṇa." [298]

This is another purpose served by the Śruti. Since Vāc is but Prāṇa (i.e. not different from it), therefore, Praṇa itself is the deity of the Udgītha.

कौष्ठ्याग्निप्रेरितो वायुर्नानास्थानसमाहतः ।।
वर्णतामेति येनातः प्राण एव बृहस्पतिः ।। २९९ ।।

Since the wind (which is) sent up by the fire in the belly, (being) obstructed at different places (in the body) becomes one Varṇa[1] (or another), therefore, Prāṇa is Bṛhaspati.[2] [299]

Bṛhaspati means Lord of Bṛhatī metre which is a form of speech; therefore, Prāṇa which controls speech, is called the Lord of speech, i.e. Bṛhaspati.

[1]It signifies 'syllable or letter'.

[2]This is to explain the oneness of Vāc and Prāṇa, though these two are not synonymous.

यजुर्ब्रह्मेति श्रवणावन्ते साम्नो ग्रहादपि ।।
ऋग्यजुःसामनिर्देशः क्रमेणेति प्रतीयते ।। ३०० ।।

Because in the text *yajur brahma* is heard (in the beginning and) in the end and also there is a mention[1] of Sāman; therefore, it is understood that there is the mention (of Prāṇa) in the order (of the names) Ṛc, Yajus and Sāman.[2] [300]

This is to explain why Bṛhaspati in the passage under discussion is not one who is the priest of the gods.

[1]It literally means 'inclusion of the word *sāmnaḥ*'.

[2]This refers to the earlier statement *sa evarkpatiḥ* and the following: *eṣa u eva brahmaṇaspatiḥ/ vāg vai brahma tasyā eṣa patiḥ/ tasmād u brahmaṇaspatiḥ*; in this passage, *brahman* means *yajus*. The tenor of the passage ends with *eṣa u eva sāma.....sāmatvam*.

Verses 301-316 *explain* BU 1.3.22.

सेति वाचोऽभिधानं स्यादमः प्राणाभिधा तथा ।।
सामोभयं समुदितं गुणप्राधान्यरूपतः ।। ३०१ ।।
एकार्थवृत्तिता यस्मात्तेनैकवचनं कृतम् ।।
शब्दयोः सामयोस्तस्मात्प्राणः सामाभिधीयते ।। ३०२ ।।

[Prāṇa is of the nature of Śāman.]

sā is[1] the name of speech; in the same way, *ama* is the name of Prāṇa. Then the two (viz. *sā* and *ama*), uttered together, are, on account of the prominence of their quality (of creating), 'Sāman'.[2] [301]
And since (there is in them) the capacity to function (together) for conveying a unitary sense, therefore, (the compound of) the two words *sā* and *ama* is made into (*sāma*) expressive of one (individual). (It is) for this reason that Prāṇa is called '*Sāman*'. [302]

[1]*syāt=asti*, but it is literally 'would be', Sureśvara has used this word in this sense earlier also.

[2]Though this is Sāma, the verse uses the neutre form 'Sāman'.

इतरस्यापि सामत्वं प्राणनिर्वर्त्यतो मतम् ।।
प्राण एव ततः साम युक्तो वागुपसर्जनः ।। ३०३ ।।

The character of being *Sāman* of the other[1] is also accepted because it is brought about by Prāṇa. Therefore, Prāṇa himself is *Sāman* (and thus) it is reasonable to mention it as accompanied by the modifier, 'Vāc'[2]. [303]

That is to say: Since a Sāman can exist depending upon Prāṇa, the latter can be called Sāman.

[1]The word 'other' refers to Prāṇa and that is other than the song (*gīti*). Cp. the Mīmāṁsā rule: *gītiṣu sāmākhyā* (*Mīmāṁsā Sutra* 2.1.36).

[2]This is the metaphorical use of the word Prāṇa, i.e. not in its primary sense: '*mukhya prāṇa*', but in the secondary sense: *vāgyukta prāṇa*. SP points to the example *mañcāḥ krośanti* which means *mañcasthāḥ krośanti*. Those who occupy the bedsteads, viz. the children, are the principally intended subject, yet the secondarily intended bedsteads stand for them.

निःशेषभूतसाम्याद्वा साम प्राणोऽभिधीयते ।।
प्रत्यगज्ञानहेतुत्वात्तज्जस्यानन्त्यमुच्यते ।। ३०४ ।।

Or[1], Prāṇa is called *sāma* because of its being the same (or, similar)[2] to all the beings without exception. This infinity (in respect of the number) of what is produced from Prāṇa is stated on account of the ignorance about (the nature) of the inner self. [304]

[1]It shows an additional explanation, on the basis of the Upaniṣad: *yad v eva samaḥ pluṣiṇā samo maśakena...*

[2]By this is meant 'similar in size'. Cf. the next verse. Or perhaps the following grammatical explanation is meant: *sama eva sāmaḥ* (like *prajña eva prājñaḥ*).

अतिसूक्ष्मशरीरा हि पुत्तिका प्लुषिरुच्यते ।।
पुत्तिकादिशरीरेण समः प्राणस्तदाश्रयात् ।। ३०५ ।।

Indeed an ant, which has a very small body, is called *pluṣi* 'a gnat' (and) Prāṇa, because it can reside in it, is similar (in size) to the body of a gnat etc.[1] [305]

[1]This supports the suggestion above that Sureśvara has in mind the grammatical explanation *sama eva sāmaḥ*.

मशकेभविराड्देहैः समः प्राणो यथोदितः ।।
तथा हैरण्यगर्भेण लिङ्गात्मा सम एव तु ।। ३०६ ।।

As Prāṇa has been described in the Śruti (to be) similar (in size) to (the bodies of) a gnat, an elephant and the Virāj, so is Prāṇa known to have the most subtle manifest from, viz. that of Hiraṇyagarbha. [306]

This stresses the fact that Prāṇa is both *kriyāśaktimat* and *jñānaśaktimat*.

वाय्वात्मनि समाप्तत्वात्करणानामशेषतः ।।
सर्वदेहसमत्वं स्यात्प्राणिकर्मानुरूपतः ।। ३०७ ।।

Since there has been a fulfilment (of the functions) of all the organs, without exception, on account of Ātman in the form of the wind (in the body), therefore, (Prāṇa has)

similarity (in size) with all bodies, according to the deeds of (those) beings (in their previous lives). [307]

प्रतिप्राणिपरिच्छेदो ज्ञानकर्मानुरोधतः ।।
धर्माधर्मानपेक्षः सन्नानन्त्येनावतिष्ठते ।। ३०८ ।।

The (defined or limited) dimension (of the body) of each being is in accordance with the knowledge and activity (of the self residing in it in an earlier life). Therefore, Prāṇa exists in infinite number (of them) irrespective of (their) merit and demerit. [308]

साम्न आप्नोति सायुज्यमैकात्म्यं प्राणरूपताम् ।।
समानलोकतानेन सालोक्यमिति शब्द्यते ।। ३०९ ।।

It is said (in the Śruti) that one obtains through a Sāman union (with Prāṇa), oneness (with it), viz. the nature of Prāṇa; this is belonging to the same region as of Prāṇa, that means being in the same world as that of Prāṇa. [309]

The world would comprise multiplicity of forms. This indicates the existence of different products/transformations of Prāṇa together with it.

विकल्पासंश्रवाद्विद्वानश्नुतेऽतः फलद्वयम् ।।
वैचित्र्याद्भावनादेर्वा त्रिविधं फलमुच्यते ।। ३१० ।।

Therefore, owing to the non-mention of any further division,[1] there is only the twofold reward.[2] But, on account of the variety of the impulse to activity etc., the same is described as threefold.[3] [310]

[1]Basic division (*bheda*) is Prāṇa(= Hiraṇyagarbha) and individuals, and there is no further mention of anything beyond Prāṇa and its products/transformation, the individuals.

[2]They are Sāyujya and Sārūpya.

[3]This reference (as the third) is to Sālokya in the preceding verse.

भूयोल्पीयःफलत्वं चेत्तुल्यसाधनयोर्न तत् ।।
योगैश्वर्यात्समा सिद्धिः कालादेरीश्वराद्यतः ।। ३११ ।।

(If someone would argue:) 'In the case of the two causes[1] which are equal, would not there result the state that there are greater and smaller reward?'. (To this our answer is:) 'It is not so, because the reward is equal on account of the excellence of Yoga,[2] as coming from the Lord, the beginning[3] of time'. [311]

[1]It means 'knowledge and activity'.

[2]It means: 'which stands for knowledge and activity functioning: together'.

[3]Could the word *kālādi* be alternatively translated as 'coming from Time, the first (of life), i.e. the Lord, viz. Hiraṇyagarbha'?

एकमेव जगद्बीजमीशाभिप्रायाहेतुतः ।।
भूरिनानाप्रभेदेन प्रत्यात्मं व्यवतिष्ठते ।। ३१२ ।।

Only one seed (i.e. cause) of this world abides in each of the bodies[1] in the numerous and various forms (in the same), owing to the (varied) intention of the Lord.[2] [312]

This explains the idea of *samānalokatā* mentioned in verse 309 above.

[1]Or (better) atternatively 'in each individual self'.

[2]Or alternatively, as SP and NKL state, 'on account of the (various) appearance of the Lord'.

कुर्यान्मेरावणुधियमणौ मेरुधियं तथा ।।
सर्वत्राप्रतिघात्येव प्रत्यगज्ञो महेश्वरः ।। ३१३ ।।

As one (who is ignorant) would entertain the notion of an atom in the case of Mt. Meru or the notion of Mt. Meru in the case of an atom, (so also) the great Lord (Prāṇa), though everywhere unobstructed, is (in that embodied state) ignorant of (itself as) the inner self. [313]

This explains how variety in the world exists through Māyā, the Lord remaining unchanged.

अतत्त्वज्ञस्य तमसो रज्ज्वज्ञानोरगादिवत् ॥
अष्टावस्थाप्रभेदेन मिथ्याज्ञानं प्रजायते ॥ ३१४ ॥

In the case of that one, who does not know the true nature (of the self within), there arises, owing to ignorance, false knowledge, (which one is) in the variety of eight states,[1] like the knowledge (that there is a) serpent etc. from the ignorance about (a real) rope (etc.) [314]

This verse continues the thought of *pratyagajña* in the preceding verse.

[1]According to the editor of NKL, these eight states are: *śarīra, indriya, manas, buddhi, viṣaya, virāj, sūtra* and *antaryāmin*. In SP, these are montioned as: *piṇḍa jāti, virāj, sūtra, daiva, avyākṛta, antaryāmin* and *sākṣin*.

प्रत्यगज्ञानविध्वस्तौ रज्ज्वज्ञानहताविव ॥
तत्कल्पितनिवृत्तिः स्यादष्टावस्थस्य बोधतः ॥ ३१५ ॥

When the ignorance about (the true nature of) the inner self is destroyed thanks to the knowledge about the one having eight states, there is removal of (the awareness of) whatever is imagined (as the modification) of it, just as (the cognition of a serpent arising from a rope is struck down) when the ignorance about the (true) rope is removed. [315]

अनात्मवस्तु सकलं प्रत्यगज्ञानहेतुजम् ॥
यथा तथोत्तरत्रापि युक्तिभिश्चाभिधास्यते ॥ ३१६ ॥

As (is said here) all the non-Ātman (i.e. the world) is born of the ignorance (on the part of an individual) about (the true nature) of the inner self, so also will it be explained in later portion, and with reasons. [316]

There is reference to SV, where Śruti and reasoning are used for proving *anātmajñāna* as *pratyagajñānaja*. In the Śruti passage, *tadd hedam*..., the same mode of reasoning is employed.

Verses 317-320 *explain* BU 1.3.20.

औद्गात्रमेव चोद्गीथो भक्तिर्वा काचिदिष्यताम् ।।
प्रसिद्धेरिति चेन्मैवमुद्गीथो ह्यसुरेव तु ।। ३१७ ।।

[Prāṇā is the Udgītha.]

(If one were to say: 'Tell us) if the Udgītha should be taken as only the activity of the Udgātṛ priest or as any one of the divisions of the Udgītha song, because it is so known.'. (Our answer is:) 'Let it not be so[1] (understood); the Udgītha is indeed only Prāṇa.' [317]

[1]It means: 'let it not be in two ways'.

उपसर्ग उदित्येष स चात्यन्तक्रियाश्रितः ।।
संयोज्य क्रिययातस्तं व्याचष्टे श्रुतिरञ्जसा ।। ३१८ ।।

This *ut* (element in the word *udgītha*,) is a preposition and it is connected with a vigorous action. Therefore, the Śruti, after connecting (it) with (the verb expressive of) action, has explained it smoothly (clearly). [318]

उत्तब्धं विधृतं यस्मात्प्राणेन जगदित्वरम् ।।
उत्प्राणोऽतः प्रसिद्धस्तु गुणादुद्गीथ उच्यते ।। ३१९ ।।

Since this flitting world is supported, i.e. held up, by Prāṇa, therefore *ut* has become known as Prāṇa and (*tu*) is on account of (this) property, called Udgītha. [319]

NKL and the text of BUBV with NKL read *prasiddhiḥ* for *prasiddhaḥ*! In that case, the translation could be: '...*ut* is Prāṇa; the (commonly) accepted (knowledge about is:), owing to its excellence, it is called Udgītha.' Not a satisfactory reading!

अनया गीयते यस्माद्गीथा वाक्तेन भण्यते ।।
उच्च गीथा च तद्योगादुद्गीथ इति शब्द्यते ।। ३२० ।।

Since (the song) is sung by this (speech), therefore speech is called Gīthā. (Thus there are these two words) *ut* and

gīthā and by the joining of them there is uttered the word *udgītha*.[1] [320]

[1]Sureśvara derives the word *udgītha* from *ut+gīthā*.

Verses 321-322 *explain BU* 1.3.24: *tadd hāpi...*

उद्गाता नैमिषीयाणामयास्योपासनादभूत् ।।
अयास्यनामा सोऽगायद्वाचा प्राणप्रधानया ।। ३२१ ।।

(Some Ṛṣi) Ayāsya by name became, on account of his worship of Ayāsya (Prāṇa), the Udgātṛ of the dwellers of Naimiṣa[1] forest; he sang (the Sāmans) by his speech devoted to Prāṇa. [321]

[1]NKL edition reads *naimiaśa*! Not so in verse 328 below.

बृहस्पत्यादिभिर्धर्मैरुपास्यानमनो भवेत् ।।
भावनोत्कर्षतोऽतोऽयं विचारस्तं प्रतीष्यते ।। ३२२ ।।

One would become mindful of Prāṇa after having worshipped Prāṇa with its appelations Bṛhaspati etc. Therefore, on account of the excellence of devotion (*bhāvanā*), this (=the following) thought about it is discussed (hereafter).[1] [322]

[1]SP adds: *śastrārthadārḍhyārtham.*

हृदयेनाभिसंबन्धाद्देवतात्र प्रजापतिः ।।
उद्गीथदेवतेहास्तु सविता वा मनःश्रितः ।। ३२३ ।।
वागीश्वरत्वादिन्द्रो वा यदि वा वर्णदेवता ।।
पदवाक्यस्वरस्थाननादादिविषयापि वा ।। ३२४ ।।

(One might say:) 'Because there is a connection of the heart (with this activity of the Udgātṛ), therefore, the deity here (would be) Prajāpati. Or, let the deity of the Udgitha be Savitṛ who rests in the mind.' [323]
'Or, (may the deity be) Indra, because he is the Lord of speech.
Or, (may the deity be) that of each of the letter, the word,

the sentence, the accent, and the place of articulation, and sound etc.[1]'. [324]

These two verses refer to different views about 'who is the deity of the Udgītha?. These are the different deities: Prajāpati, Savitṛ (=the Moon; cf. SP and NKL), Indra (refer to verse 265 above) and other linguistic features.

[1]The word *ādi* at the end refers *sūkta, prakaraṇa* and *kāṇḍa* etc.

एवं विप्रतिपन्नेषु नानावादिषु निश्चितः ।।
प्राणप्रधानया वाचा ह्ययास्योऽगायदित्यतः ।।
ब्रह्मदत्तश्चकारोच्चैः शपथं वादिनः प्रति ।। ३२५ ।।
यदितोऽनप्रधानाया वाचो ह्यन्येन केनचित् ।।
देवान्तरेण सोऽगायदयास्यः प्राणविग्रहः ।। ३२६ ।।
सर्वप्रमाणभूतोऽभूदुद्गाता सत्रिणां पुरा ।।
विसंवादस्त्वभूत्तेषामुद्दिश्योद्गीथदेवताम् ।। ३२७ ।।

When there are thus variously speaking opponents; (Brahmadatta) was decided as to that; since Ayāsya, with his speech devoted to Prāṇa, sang aloud. Therefore, he loudly announced this (i.e. he is Ayāsya Prāṇa) with an oath to those who held a contrary view [325]
(thus:) 'If he, Ayāsya, in the form of Prāṇa, recited the song through a deity other than speech, which was devoted to Prāṇa[1]— [326]
There was, formerly, for the sacrificers (of Naimiṣa forest) an Udgātṛ priest, (who was) accepted by all (of them) as the authority, (and yet) there arose a dispute among them as regards the deity of the Udgītha.[2] [327]

[1]This is to be connected with (i) verse 328 below and (ii) the principal clause in verse 329 below, though some details of the narrative intervene between this line and the principal clause.

[2]This verse should really serve as introductory to verse 324 above.

उद्गाता नैमिषीयाणां मदभ्युपगताद्यदि ।।
प्राणवाग्द्वयतोऽन्येन देवेनासौ प्रयत्नवान् ।। ३२८ ।।

उदगायत्तदा सोमो भक्ष्यमाणः शिरो मम ।।
मिथ्याभिवादिनः साक्षाद्विपातयतु सत्वरः ।। ३२९ ।।

'If, for the dewellers of the Naimiṣa (forest), an Udgātṛ (other) than the one known to me (viz. Ayāsya), exerting, sang through a deity other than the pair of Prāṇa and speech,[1] [328]
then may this Soma, which I am drinking, (itself), hastening, cut off the head of me who am speaking untruth.'. [329]

[1]This is the restatement of the contents of verse 326.

श्रुतिः समर्थयामास वाचेति शपथक्रियाम् ।।
शपथस्यापि मानत्वमस्मादेव तु कारणात् ।। ३३० ।।

The Śruti has justified this announcement with an oath (of Brahmadatta) by the word *vācā* 'through speech'; therefore, just for this reason, an oath also can be an authoritative means (even today).[1] [330]

[1]This is, in a way, an expression of what is known as Bandhutā philosophy of the Brāhmaṇas adopted by Sureśvara in his explanation of the narrative. Cf. SP for a little longer discussion on an oath as an authoritative means of knowing or ascertaining the truth, based on *Mīmāṁsā Sūtra* 1.3.1-2; 15-16.

वाचः प्राणस्य च यत उद्गीथे व्यापृतिः स्फुटा ।।
प्राधान्येन तदन्येषां न तथा लक्ष्यते सदा ।। ३३१ ।।

Since the functioning (lit. activity) of speech and Prāṇa (together) is ever clearly visible as the predominant, therefore, (the activity) of others[1] is not noticed in a similar way. [331]
[1]It means 'organs and their superintending deities'.

आकृत्यर्थाभिसंबन्धादभिधानस्य न श्रुतेः ।।
ब्रह्मदत्ताभिसंबन्धादनित्यत्वं प्रसज्यते ।। ३३२ ।।

Since a name has connection only with the shape (of what is named), therefore, (in the narrative of Brahmadatta),

there does not forcefully follow the contingency of impermanence (i.e. unauthoritativeness) (in respect) of the Śruti (statement) on account of[1] its connection with Brahmadatta. [332]

This is in answer to the implied objection: 'Since Brahmadatta is, like us human beings, liable to perish, the statement of the Śruti about his doing, viz. announcing with an oath, is not authoritative.' Cf. *Mīmāṁsā Sūtra* 1.3.33: *ākṛtis tu kriyārthatvāt* '(a name mentioned conveys) the shape only (of an individual), and nothing else' ('nothing' includes the name also!), for that serves the purpose of *kriyā* 'what is to be done'—Sureśvara bases his answer on this. [For relevant details on the application of the Mīmāṁsā rule, cf. SP].

[1]That is, though it has connection...

Verses 333-338 *explain BU* 1.3.25.

उद्गीथदेवतामेवं परीक्ष्याथाधुना श्रुतिः ।।
स्वादिधर्मांभिसंबन्धं प्रचक्राम प्रभाषितुम् ।। ३३३ ।।

Having thus fully considered[1] (as to who is) the deity of the Udgītha, the Śruti now proceeds to explain the relation (of the sacrificer) to (him, who is) his own beginning (i.e. Prāṇa)[2]. [333]

[1]It literally means 'examined'.
[2]*svādi* = *syasya ādi*; cf. *kālādi* in verse 311 above (one of the alternative explanations).

याजमानमिदं ज्ञानं स्वादेः प्राग्यत्समीरितम् ।।
पञ्चमाद्युक्तिदृष्टचास्य ह्येकवाक्यत्वहेतुतः ।। ३३४ ।।

What has been stated before, viz. this worship[1] (offered) by the sacrificers, is the knowledge of his own beginning (viz. Prāṇa)[2], because it forms unity (of sense) of the statement with what is stated in the beginning of the fifth chapter.[3] [334]

[1]It means *jñāna* (of the Ātman) and (also) *vijñāna* (of the procedure of ritual service) in this context; this is *upāsanā*; cf. note 1 by the editor of NKL (p. 131) *atra praghaṭṭake jñanavijñānaśabdau upāsanaparau vācyau.*

[2]Cf. the word *svādi* (and note thereon) in the preceding verse.

[3]This is traditional reference to BU ch. 3. This is to say that the sentence *kena yajamāno mṛtyor āptim atimucyate* (BU 3.1.3) has connection with *yajamāna* and the meaning is: 'worship offered by a sacrificer'.

स्वसुवर्णप्रतिष्ठाधीरुद्गातुरिति गम्यते ।।
ऋत्विङ्नामाभिसंबन्धान्न त्वसौ यजमानगा ।। ३३५ ।।

It is understood that the property,[1] (viz.) gold, steadiness, and intelligence belong to (i.e. are obtained by) the Udgātṛ; and[2] not[3] to the sacrificer, because of its connection with the name of the *ṛtvij*.[4] [335]

[1]It literally means 'his own (belongings)'.

[2]The word *tu* is understood in the sense of *ca*.

[3]Cryptic for 'it does not go'.

[4]Namely, the Udgātṛ, this is understood from *tasmād ārvijyāṁ kariṣyan*.

एष एवंविदुद्गातेत्यमुतो लिङ्गतो भवेत् ।।
उद्गातुरपि विज्ञानं दृष्टार्थत्वाच्च कारणात् ।। ३३६ ।।

From this indication, viz. *eṣa evaṁvid udgātā*, follows that the worship[1] is by the Udgātṛ, also (it is his) for the reason, viz. the purpose, (already) seen. [336]

[1]This is for *vijñāna* 'knowledge of the procedure of worship, viz. ritual'; cf. note 1 on verse 334 above.

कर्त्राश्रितं स्वं विज्ञेयं माधुर्यादीह सामनि ।।
यतस्तद्धनवत्तस्मात्स्वरार्थं यत्नमाचरेत् ।। ३३७ ।।

Since the sweetness etc. in the Sāman (in the Udgāna[1]) is to be known as his own (wealth[2]), (and) that (Sāman) is

full of riches,[3] therefore, (the Udgātṛ) should make an effort for (uttering) that sound. [337]

[1]This is meant by the word *iha*.
[2]It means 'the property belonging to the agent'.
[3]Cf. SP: *tat sāma sausvaryopetaṁ dhanavad bhūṣitam ṛddhimat.*

धनवन्तं यथा यत्नाद्दिदृक्षन्तीह संघशः ।।
तथा यत्नात्समीक्षन्ते स्वरसंपत्समन्वितम् ।। ३३८ ।।

As, in this world, people, in flocks, wish to see with effort[1] someone possessed of wealth, similarly,[2] they[3] see with effort[1] him who is possessed of the wealth of speech.[4] [338]

[1]It means 'being devoted to'.
[2]But read SP on *tathā: athośabdo yathārthaḥ*. Further, SP adds, after *yathārthaḥ, tasmācchabdas tathārthaḥ*. Should this indicate that SP reads the first line as *dhanavantam atho yatnād...*?
[3]Namely, sacrificers.
[4]This is Udgātṛ who can sing sweet Sāman(s).

Verses 339-344 *explain BU* 1.3.26.

बाह्यवित्तेन संबन्धमुक्त्वाथान्तर्धनात्मना ।।
संबन्धं वक्तुकामेयं प्रचक्रामोत्तरा श्रुतिः ।। ३३९ ।।

Having (thus) stated the relation (of the Udgātṛ or Prāṇa) to the external wealth, this subsequent Śruti has now proceeded with a desire to state the relation (of the same) to the internal wealth. [339]

बाह्योऽस्य धर्मः सौस्वर्यं सौवर्ण्यं त्वान्तरं धनम् ।।
तदन्तरतमोऽनस्य प्रतिष्ठागुण उच्यते ।। ३४० ।।

Sweetness (of pronunciation) is the external property and the richness of good syllables, (viz. the pronunciation of good syllables), the internal property of this one (i.e. the Udgātṛ, Prāṇa). However, for Prāṇa, the property of steadiness is the innermost (as compared to them).[1] [340]

[1]Namely, *sausvarya* and *sauvarṇya*.

जिह्वामूलीयकादीनि ह्यष्टौ स्थानानि वागिह ।।
गानप्रतिष्ठाहेतुत्वाद्धीति हेतुवचस्तथा ।। ३४१ ।।

Here[1] speech means the eight places (of articulation), the root of the tongue etc.[2] themselves (*hi*), on account of their being the cause of the steadiness of the (Sāman-)song. And *hi* in the (Śruti) statement is expressive of the cause (viz. the steadiness). [341]

[1]That is, in the Śruti sentence under discussion.
[2]The word 'etc.' refers to *uras*, *śiras*, *kaṇṭha*, *danta*, *oṣṭha*, *nāsikā* and *tālu*.

अन्नप्रतिष्ठमागानमेक आहुर्विपश्चितः ।।
अनिषेधाद्द्वयोरेका प्रतिष्ठेहावसीयताम् ।। ३४२ ।।

Some learned men have declared that singing (of the Sāman) is steady in food.[1] (However) let this be concluded here that there is here[2] the one basis of the two,[3] since there is no rejection (of it). [342]

[1]That means 'steady on account of it'.
[2]That is, in Prāṇa.
[3]It means *anna* and *āgāna*.

अन्नस्य परिणामेऽनः स्थितो गीतित्वमेति हि ।।
अनप्रतिष्ठा देहोऽतः श्रुत्येह प्रतिपाद्यते ।। ३४३ ।।

Indeed Prāṇa becomes the (Sāman-)song when it becomes steady in the digested form of food, therefore; (thus) it is declared by the Śruti here that the body is the basis for Prāṇa. [343]

उपासनं विकल्पेन वागन्नाख्यप्रतिष्ठयोः ।।
वाक्प्रतिष्ठमुपासीत यदि वान्नप्रतिष्ठितम् ।। ३४४ ।।

(Therefore) the worship prescribed here is alternatively of

the two which have their bases in what are called speech and food; (that is to say:) one may worship Prāṇa resting in speech or Prāṇa resting in food. [344]

Verses 345-377 *explain BU* 1-3-28: *explanation of Abhyāroha-japa and the meanings of its Mantras.*

यदर्थमतियत्नेन महिमानस्य कीर्तितः ।।
अभ्यारोहजपः सोऽथ प्राप्तावसर उच्यते ।। ३४५ ।।

Now, as there is occasion for it,[1] (here) is stated that Abhyārohajapa with reference to which the greatness of Prāṇa has been so far stated with great effort. [345]

There is reference to the sentence *athātaḥ pavamānānām...*
[1]This is meant by the word *atha.*

यथोक्तज्ञानवत्तायामिदं कर्म विधिस्त्यते ।।
कार्त्स्न्येन तस्य चोक्तत्वादतस्तदभिधीयते ।। ३४६ ।।

This (ritual) activity will be described (in the following) when (one is) in possession of the knowledge as stated (before). And since it is (earlier) described in its fullness, therefore, that is (now) discussed (hereafter)[1]. [346]

[1]This is meant by the word *ataḥ.*

एवं विद्वत्प्रयोज्यत्वादत एव न सूत्रितम् ।।
नित्यकर्मेव सूत्रेषु तेन विद्वत्प्रयोज्यता ।। ३४७ ।।

Only, therefore, it is not mentioned in the Sūtra texts, in the same way as an obligatory rite (is not mentioned), since it is prescribed for one who has thus known; hence the nature of it as what is prescribed for the knower.[1] [347]

[1]That is, as optional, or not invariable.

उद्गीथलिङ्गसंयोगाद्गानमात्रेऽस्य शक्तितः ।।
नियमोऽस्यैवकारेण पवमानेषु कथ्यते ।। ३४८ ।।

Since this one[1] has potence (or capacity) in respect only of the singing (of the Udgītha part of the Sāman-)song on account of its[2] association (lit. connection) with the characteristics[3] of the Udgītha, therefore there is stated a restriction[4] of it in relation to the Pavamāna Stotras, by the word *eva*.[5] [348]

This is the significance of *pavamānānām*.

[1]That is, Abhyārohajapa.

[2]It means 'the association of the prescription of Abhyārohajapa'.

[3]Refer to *udghītena atyayāma*. This is indicative of the relation of the Abhyārohajapa to the Udgītha.

[4]This is in point of time, that is to say: It should be recited only at the time of singing the Pavamāna Stotras.

[5]If such a restriction was not stated, one could understand that the Udgāna 'loud singing' would be necessary at the time of (all Parts of Sāman:) Udgītha, Pratihāra Prastāva etc.

ततोऽपि कालसंकोचं स वा इत्याविनावदत् ॥
प्रस्तोता प्रस्तुयाद्यत्र तदैतानि जपेदिति ॥ ३४९ ॥

And, yet further, the Śruti mentioned a restriction in respect of time[1] in the passage beginning with *sa vai*...and ending in *prastotā...japet*. [349]

This refers to the purpose of the sentence *sa vai khalu*....

[1]Cf. note 4 on the preceding verse.

एतानीति च निर्देशाद्यजूंषीत्यवगम्यते ॥
श्रुतावेव च दृष्टत्वात्स्वरः शातपथो जपे ॥ ३५० ॥

And from the use of the word *etāni* it is understood that the *yajus* (formulas) are also (to be recited). And, since this is seen only in the Śruti, therefore, the accent in the recitation (of the Abhyārohajapa Mantra) should be that seen in the *Śathapatha Brāhmaṇa*.[1] [350]

[1]Though there is a reference to a Mantra, one should recite

in accordance with the rules of accent of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa whose concluding portion is BU. The Saṁhitā accent should not be followed.

जपकर्माभिधा चेयमभ्यारोह इतीष्यते ।।
यौगिकी चाभिधा ज्ञेया क्रियायोगस्य संभवात् ।। ३५१ ।।

And, this mention of the act of recitation is known as Abhyārohajapa; this name is, it should be remembered (lit. known), one based on etymology, for it is possible to connect it (i.e. the etymology) with action. [351]

हित्वाध्यात्मपरिच्छेदं दैवं बीजमतः परम् ।।
अभ्यारोहत्यनेनातो ह्यभ्यारोहो जपः स्मृतः ।। ३५२ ।।

(To explain the above:) Having thrown away the limitation of the body, (the worshipper) thereafter rises to (the status of) the cause (lit. seed) of the divine (form), by means of this (Mantra); therefore,[1] the recitation (of it) is called Abhyārohajapa. [352]

[1]That is, on account of this explanation of the etymology.

तिरोहितार्थरूपत्वान्मन्त्राणां न नृधीगतिः ।।
मन्त्रार्थं स्वयमेवातो व्याचष्टे श्रुतिरञ्जसा ।। ३५३ ।।

Since the Mantras are of such nature that they have a meaning-form which is concealed, therefore, there is no approach to them for human intellect.[1] Therefore, the Śruti itself clearly explained the meaning of that Mantra. [353]

[1]This is a general statement about the Mantras and, therefore, the second line justifies the name and significance of the Abhyārohajapa.

पूर्वं पदार्थान्व्याख्याय पश्चाद्वाक्यार्थमब्रवीत् ।।
फलं पश्चाद्यथोक्तस्येत्येष व्याख्याक्रमः श्रुतेः ।। ३५४ ।।

Having first explained the meanings of the words, it later declared the meaning(s) of sentence(s); then (it stated) the

reward of what was explained—this is the order of (the items in) the explanation given in the Śruti. [354]

यत्स्यात्स्वाभाविकं ज्ञानं यच्च कर्म स्वभावजम् ।।
तदधःपातहेतुत्वान्मन्त्रेऽसदिति भण्यते ।। ३५५ ।।

Whatever might be the natural[1] knowledge and whatever, the natural[1] activity (for one), they are, owing to being the cause of one's fall; stated in the Śruti Mantra[2] as *asat*. [355]

This verse explains the purpose of the use of the word *asat* in the Abhyārohajapa.

[1]That is *svabhāvataḥ prāpta* (*-jñāta*); not *śāstrataḥ jñāta*.

[2]In the Mantra: *asato mā sad gamaya*.

सद्देवभावहेतुत्वाच्छास्त्रीये ज्ञानकर्मणी ।।
सत्पदेनाभिधीयेते मन्त्रेऽस्मिन्प्राग्यथोदिते ।। ३५६ ।।

Since knowledge and ritual activity, prescribed or declared in the Śruti, have *sat* as the cause for their rise to the (eternal) state of the divine being, (therefore), the two, as explained before, are mentioned in this Mantra by the word *sat*. [356]

असन्मृत्युस्तयोर्ज्ञेयः पूर्वयोर्मृत्युहेतुतः ।।
अमृतं मृत्युघातित्वाच्छास्त्रीये ज्ञानकर्मणी ।। ३५७ ।।

asat should be understood (in the sense of) the death of the first two,[1] because it is the cause of the death for one (in the world), and knowledge and ritual activity, which are prescribed in the Śāstra, (are to be understood as) imperishable, because they avert (lit. destroy) death. [357]

[1]These are *aśāstrīya*, i.e. *svabhāvataḥ prāptejñānakrmaṇī*; cf. *āsurajñānakarmans* mentioned in just the next verse.

आसुरज्ञानकर्मभ्यां मां व्युत्थाप्याथ तज्जितेः ।।
गमयाशु ततो दैवे शास्त्रीये ज्ञानकर्मणी ।। ३५८ ।।

Having raised me up above the demoniac knowledge and activity, then, by the victory over them, reach me quickly (away from them) unto the divine knowledge and activity, which are prescribed by the Śruti. [358]

This is the meaning/paraphrase of the Abhyārohajapa-Mantra.

मन्त्रार्थे यत्नमाहाथ ह्यमृतं मामिति श्रुतिः ।।
द्वितीयमन्त्रानूक्तिः स्यात्तमसो मेत्युदीरणम् ।। ३५९ ।।

The Śruti *amṛtam mām* (for *mā*) has stated the specific (purpose) in (i.e. of) the meaning of the Mantra. (And) the statement *tamaso mā*...should be understood as a re-statement (in the explanation) of the earlier Mantra. [359]

आपेक्षिकत्वान्मृत्युः स्याच्छास्त्रीये ज्ञानकर्मणी ।।
स्वार्थं फलमपेक्ष्यैते परार्थत्वात्तमो मते ।। ३६० ।।

Knowledge and activity, prescribed in the Śruti, would be (i.e. would result into) death (for one), since they are rooted in some desire(s). Since these two (viz. the knowledge and activity prescribed in the Śāstra) serve (now as a means) to the acquisition of the highest,[1] (only) after they have first expected[2] their own result, they are considered to be darkness.[3] [360]

[1]The knowledge of Prāṇa or Ātman.
[2]That is, secured.
[3]Namely, ignorance.

साधनात्तमसो मां त्वं ज्योतिः साध्यं नयामृतम् ।।
फलाप्त्यैव तमोध्वंसादमृतं मेत्यतोऽवदत् ।। ३६१ ।।

Therefore (the Śruti) stated: From the means, the darkness, do you lead me to the goal, the imperishable lustre by securing for me the fruit, by destroying the darkness. [361]

पूर्वयोर्मन्त्रयोर्योऽर्थो विस्तरेणोदितः पुनः ।।
मन्त्रेण स तृतीयेन संक्षेपेणाभिधीयते ।। ३६२ ।।

The meaning of the first two Mantras which is stated in the Śruti at length is again stated in brief by the third Mantra. [362]

This re-statement of a thought, in brief, should not be taken as repetition. This holds good in respect of verse 359 which is a re-statement of what is stated in 356 above. Such is the procedure of the Śruti followed by later writers of Śāstra—cf. SP: *ata eva hi saṁgrahavivaraṇarūpaṁ grantham āracayanti śāstrakṛtaḥ.*

प्रसङ्गमुत्तरे मन्त्रे पूर्वयोरिव वीक्ष्य हि ।।
तिरोहितार्थतामाह नात्रेत्यादिवचः श्रुतिः ।। ३६३ ।।

Having seen that, in the case of the subsequent (i.e. the third) Mantra, there would be a contingency, viz. the obscurity of its meaning, as in the case of the two previous (Mantras), the Śruti states the words *na atra*... [363]

यथाप्रार्थितमागाय याजमानं फलं परम् ।।
त्रिष्वेव पवमानेषु यथा वागादिभिः पुरा ।। ३६४ ।।

After having first sung only three Pavamāna (Stotras), according to the request (by the sacrificer[1]), the highest (as the) reward for the sacrificer,[2] as did Speech and others in former times, [364]

The paraphrase in SP and NKL shows that they regard this verse as difficultly worded.

[1]The compound *yathāprārthitam* is *sāpekṣa samāsa*, therefore *yajamānena* has to be supplied.

[2]The word *yājamāna* is understood as *yajamānāya phaladam.*

अथ यानीतराणीति ह्युद्गातान्नाद्यमात्मने ।।
आगायेद्वचनात्कर्तुः कामयोगोऽपि गम्यते ।। ३६५ ।।

'Let the singer (now) sing *yānītarāṇi* 'which are others',[1] (viz. resulting in) food and the eatable for his own sake.[2] (Here) from the mention of the agent is understood also his connection with a desire. [365]

This verse explains *atha yānītaraṇi stotrāṇi* (BU 1.3.28).
[1]i.e. remaining verses.
[2]Read SP: *yājamānam pavamāneṣūdgānam ārtvijyam anyatrety arthaḥ/ āgānasya dvaividhyaprasiddhyartho hiśabdaḥ.*

कस्मादात्मन आगायेदिति हेतुरिहोच्यते ।।
यस्मात्स एष एवंविदुद्गातातोऽन एव सः ।। ३६६ ।।

Now here is stated the reason as to why he should sing for himself: Since the one who is that (viz. the singer), viz. a knower of such (nature of the Udgāna), therefore, he is Prāṇa himself. [366]

Sureśvara refers to BU: *sa eṣa evaṁvid*...in accordance with the maxim, *pragītamantrasādhyaguṇabuddhistotram arthāc ca* (SP).

अतोऽलमात्मने कामानागातुं स्वामिने तथा ।।
यस्मादीश्वर उद्गाता कामावाप्तावतः शुभम् ।। ३६७ ।।
तस्मात्तेषु वरं कामं यजमानो यथारुचि ।।
नवसूद्गीयमानेषु तं वृणीताविचारयन् ।। ३६८ ।।

Therefore, he is capable to sing for himself as also for his (worldly) master; since the singer (of the Sāman) is the Lord in respect of obtaining the reward, therefore from him (comes) the auspicious (reward). [367]
Therefore, may the sacrificer choose without any hesitation whatever excellent desire, as he likes, while the (other) nine (prayers) are being sung. [368]

प्रयोगानुगमे चैतद्दर्शनं येन चोद्यते ।। ३६९ ।।
तस्मात्स्याद्देवतावाप्तिर्ज्ञानकर्मसमुच्चयात् ।।
तस्मान्न काचिदाशङ्का कर्मिणं प्रति विद्यते ।। ३७० ।।

[Here is the explanation of *evaṁ tāvad*...(BUB p. 87)]

And since[1] this worship (*darśana*) is enjoined in respect of the performance (of the Jyotiṣṭoma sacrifice), [369]

therefore, there would be the attainment of (the nature of) the deity, through the combination of knowledge and ritual activity. As such, there is not (to be entertained) any doubt as regards the one who performs the rite.[2] [370]

[1]It literally means 'by which'.

[2]That is to say: as regards his attainment of the nature of the deity.

कर्महीनेऽपि विदुषि स्यान्न वेत्यतिशङ्क्यते ।।
तदाशङ्कापनुत्त्यर्थं तद्धैतदिति हि श्रुतिः ।। ३७१ ।।

It is (now) doubted further, whether (the attainment of the reward) would be possible in the case of one who knows (this importance of the Udgāna and is yet) without the performance of the ritual; therefore, for removing that doubt, indeed, proceeds the Śruti *tadd haitat*... [371]

इहैव देवभूतत्वादाशङ्का किंनिबन्धना ।।
जपकर्मानबोधाभ्यां लोकप्राप्तौ हि शङ्क्यते ।।
ज्ञानादेव भवेन्नेति तद्धैतदिति हि श्रुतिः ।। ३७२ ।।

(The Siddhāntin asks:) 'With what basis is this doubt (entertained) when (the knower) has already become the deity here itself?'. (A possible answer to this question is:) 'Indeed, the doubt is entertained because (the Śruti has conveyed that) there is the attainment of the (higher) world by means of the recitation of the Abhyārohajapa(-Mantra) and the knowing about the (nature of) Prāṇa.'. (But, there is this answer:) 'No. That[1] would follow merely knowledge, because the Śruti *tadd haitat*...(averts that opinion).'. [372]

[1]Namely, attainment of the higher world.

जीवतो देवभूतस्य भावनोपचयात्कुतः ।।
देवावाप्तौ भवेच्छङ्का मनुष्यस्य तदाप्तिवत् ।। ३७३ ।।

Since (it is thus clear that the singer) has become the deity on account of the increase in (his) devotion, while a man

is leading this very life, therefore, whence should there be the doubt entertained as regards his attaining the nature of the deity just as (one could entertain a doubt) as regards his attaining that.[1] [373]

[1]An ardent worshipper of the Udgītha becomes in this very life one with the deity Prāṇa. Therefore, there cannot be any doubt about his final attainment (viz. *brahmajñāna=brahma-bhūtatva*). The word *tadāpti* refers to this final attainment which it is impossible for a human being to achieve so long as he remains (only) a human being. Cf. *devāpti* in the next verse.

कर्मिणोऽपि हि देवाप्तिर्ज्ञानादेव न कर्मणः ।।
समुच्चयात्तु तत्प्राप्तावागमादेव निश्चितिः ।। ३७४ ।।

In the case of one who performs the ritual also, the attainment of the nature of the deity is only from knowledge but not from (mere) ritual performance. And there is (already) the decision known from, or made by, the Śruti itself as regards the attainment of that,[1] viz. (it can be) from the combination of (the two). [374]

[1]It means 'the nature of the deity as stated before'.

तद्धैतत्प्राणविज्ञानं यथाव्याख्यातरूपकम् ।।
भवेल्लोकजिदेवेह कर्मशून्यमपि ध्रुवम् ।। ३७५ ।।

The words *tadd haitat* (mean:) This knowledge about Prāṇa, whose nature has been thus explained, will certainly be the winner of the (higher) world[1] here,[2] even if it is without the performance of any ritual. [375]

[1]That is, it will win for the worshipper the state of desirelessness.
[2]That is, in this life itself. This holds good in the case of one who has acquired that knowledge.

न हैवालोक्यतायै नुरस्याशापीह विद्यते ।।
इहैव लोकभूतत्वादप्राप्तेऽर्थे हि शङ्क्यते ।। ३७६ ।।

Here,[1] in the case of this man there is not any hope indeed for fame, because he has in this very (world) become one with the world (beyond[2]). (Having a hope) can be thought of, when the end[3] is not attained. [376]

[1]It means 'When one has attained the knowledge of the deity, viz. Prāṇa'.

[2]That is, the higher world or the state of desirelessness.

[3]This refers to the state of oneness with Prāṇa.

इहैवासुरभावस्य प्राणोऽस्मीत्यभिमानतः ।।
प्रध्वस्तत्वात्कुतः शङ्का तन्मूलासंभवाद्भवेत् ।। ३७७ ।।

Since, in this very life, there is the destruction of the demoniac (sort of) existence on account of the strong feeling 'I am Prāṇa', whence could there arise a doubt (regarding hope etc. as stated in the previous verse), while there cannot be its root cause? [377]

इदमत्र विचिन्त्यं स्याज्ज्ञानकर्मसमुच्चयात् ।।
देवभावः किमुद्गातुर्यजमानस्य वाथ किम् ।। ३७८ ।।

Yet, this should be considered here (i.e. at this juncture): 'Is oneness with the deity (viz. Prāṇa), which results from the combination of knowledge and ritual activity (of the Udgāna), obtained by the Udgātṛ? or is it obtained by the sacrificer? [378]

Verses 379-383 *are an objector's view and verse* 384 *disproves the same.*

न समुच्चय उद्गातुः कर्माभावादिहेष्यते ।।
परकर्मप्रवेशात्स्यादुद्गाता न स्वकर्मणि ।। ३७९ ।।

It is not held here (i.e. in this regard) that the (said) combination is possible on the part of the Udgātṛ, for there is absence of (his performance of) ritual activity; (the reason is:) if he had participated (lit. entered upon) an activity of another, i.e. the sacrificer, (he would not be engaged) as the Udgātṛ in his own activity. [379]

There is exception to the idea of the worshipper's becoming one with Prāṇa.

क्रियायोगाच्च तन्नाम्नो ज्ञानाभ्यासोऽपि दुर्लभः ।।
साक्षात्कृतिश्च संतत्या संततिश्च न विद्यते ।। ३८० ।।

Further, owing to the association with activity of the one of that name,[1] even repeated (attempt for obtaining) knowledge is very difficult. Direct acquisition (of knowledge) results only from continuity, and this continuity[2] is not, however, seen here. [380]

[1]That is, the Udgātṛ.
[2]This refers to knowing and meditating on what is known.

न च धीजन्ममात्रेण परमात्मप्रबोधवत् ।।
संभाव्यो देवभावोऽस्य देवो भूत्वेति च श्रुतेः ।। ३८१ ।।

Further, from the statement of the Śruti *devo bhūtvā*, 'having become one with the deity'[1] becoming the deity is not possible (in the case of this one, i.e. the Udgātṛ) only by the rise of the knowledge (about the deity[2]), as by (the acquisition of) the knowledge about thc highest Ātman.[3] [381]

[1]That is, attaining the nature of the deity.
[2]It means absence of repetition mentioned in verse 380.
[3]This knowledge results from the repetition of hearing, pondering over and meditating.

उद्गातुर्विदुषो नापि परकीयेन कर्मणा ।।
समुच्चयप्रसिद्धिः स्यात्तयोर्भिन्नाश्रयत्वतः ।। ३८२ ।।

And also in the case of the Udgātṛ, who has become a knower (of the nature of Prāṇa), there would result the combination of knowledge and ritual activity by the performance (to be done) by another, for the reason that the two have (two) different supports.[1] [382]

[1]That is, knowledge on the part of the Udgātṛ and performance on the part of sacrificer.

यजमानस्य कर्मास्ति ज्ञानं तूद्गातृसंश्रयम् ।।
समुच्चयोऽतस्तस्यापि भिन्नाधिष्ठानतो न च ।। ३८३ ।।

(Now), ritual activity belongs to[1] the sacrificer, whereas knowledge rests in the Udgātṛ. Therefore, there does not follow the combination (of knowledge and ritual activity) in the case of him (i.e. the sacrificer) also, owing to their different supports.[2] [383]

[1]That is, is performed by.
[2]As explained in note 1 on the preceding verse.

मतं तद्याजमानं स्याज्ज्ञानं यत्प्रागुदीरितम् ।।
स्वयमेव कृतार्थत्वात्कापेक्षास्यर्त्विजं प्रति ।। ३८४ ।।

Therefore (*tat*), it is held that the knowledge, which has been discussed earlier, belongs to the sacrificer. (Here an objector asks:) 'Then, since he has acquired his end, why should he have expectation about the assistance of the (Udgātṛ) *ṛtvij*?' [384]

The second line is one more question put by the objector.

कर्मण्युद्गात्रपेक्षावज्ज्ञानेऽपीति मतं यदि ।।
उद्गातुरपि तत्तुल्यं नोद्गातर्ते क्रियां यतः ।। ३८५ ।।

If it were held that, like the assistance of the Udgātṛ in the performance, (assistance) is expected in acquiring knowledge also; then that (condition) is commonly shared by the Udgātṛ also, since there is no Udgātṛ without a (ritual) activity. [385]

याजमानं यथा कर्म ह्याश्रित्य फलवद्भवेत् ।।
अन्नाद्यागानमुद्गातुस्तज्ज्ञानं तद्वदाश्रितम् ।। ३८६ ।।

As the singing of the food and eatables by the Udgātṛ becomes rewarded only after resorting to the performance by the sacrificer, his knowledge also is likewise dependent (on the same). [386]

समुच्चयाच्चेदुभयोरुद्गातृयजमानयोः ॥
देवभावः किमर्थेयं तद्धैतदिति हि श्रुतिः ॥ ३८७ ॥

If becoming one with the deity would result from the combination (of knowledge and ritual activity) for both the Udgātṛ and the sacrificer, for what purpose does there occur the Śruti statement *tadd haitat*? [387]

सर्वाश्रमाणां तर्हीदं सामान्येनाभिधीयते ॥
तद्धैतदिति सिद्धत्वादुद्गातृयजमानयोः ॥ ३८८ ॥

Indeed, then, the statement *tadd haitat* is uttered for all the Āśramas in general, since it has been already established for the Udgātṛ and the sacrificer (together). [388]

देवभावेन विज्ञानं संस्करोत्येव तद्धियम् ॥
परार्थमपि सत्कस्मादनपेक्षं न सिद्धये ॥ ३८९ ॥

The knowledge (about the Udgāna), though being used for another (sacrificer), does purify his intellect,[1] by (bringing unto him) the nature of the deity. (Then,) how would it not acquire that end without expectation (of anything else)? [389]

[1]This leads him to the knowledge of Prāṇa.

iti udgīthabrāhmaṇaṁ samāptam